

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1870.

The Week.

THE principal event of the week at the French theatre of war is the battle fought on the 17th, near Dreux. It seems that after his victory before Orléans, General D'Aurelles de Paladines, having fortified his position near Chevilly, between that city and Artenay, began moving a part of his troops north-westward, in the direction of Châteaudun and Chartres, with the object of flanking the army under Von der Tann, on its right, and joining in an attack on the westernmost positions of the besieging army before Paris, to execute which French forces, belonging to the command of Kératry, had been transferred from Le Mans and elsewhere. To meet these movements, Von der Tann withdrew his troops from the line of Patay, Artenay, and Toury, on the confines of the Departments of Loiret and Eure-et-Loir, and, facing westward, occupied positions near Bazoches, Voves, and further north, on a line parallel to that of Châteaudun and Chartres. The First Bavarian Corps, which was marching to reinforce him, was arrested in its southerly movement at Etampes, and also faced westward, towards Ablis. The French forces, having formed a junction in the western part of Eure-et-Loir, advanced on the line of Châteauneuf and Versailles, passing Dreux, near which they were met by parts of the Fifth and Twelfth Corps, and other German troops, hastily gathered, under command of the Grand-Duke of Mecklenburg, from the armies before Paris or on march to reinforce Von der Tann. The result of the battle was the repulse of the French along the whole line, their hasty retreat beyond Châteauneuf, and the reoccupation of Dreux by the Prussians. Who was in command of the French—whether it was D'Aurelles de Paladines himself, Kératry, or some other general—what was the number of their forces, and what the loss on either side, we have as yet to learn.

The chief importance of the Prussian victory at Dreux consists in its securing the extreme and weakest lines of the besieging army, while Von der Tann—or his successor in command, if his rumored removal be true—is enabled to resume the offensive against D'Aurelles de Paladines, in co-operation with Prince Frederic Charles. The right wing of the army of the latter, consisting of the Third Corps, had at last accounts, in its march from the Moselle to the Loire, through Champagne, crossed the river Yonne at Sens, and was advancing to connect with Von der Tann in Orléanais, while its centre, the Ninth Corps, proceeded *via* Auxerre, obviously with the purpose of crossing the Loire between Orléans and Nevers, and operating in the rear of D'Aurelles de Paladines, on the shortest line to Tours. The French general, who is evidently conscious of the perilous condition in which this double approach places the Army of the Loire, tries in every way to fortify its main position in front of Orléans, and to secure and facilitate its retreat to the south bank of the Loire, while a fresh body of troops, designated the Eighteenth Corps, is collecting at Nevers, which may possibly offer some protection to his right flank, should he fall back on a point between Bourges and Tours.

The Prussian Tenth Corps, forming the left wing of Frederic Charles's army, advances through Burgundy towards the Saône, to join the forces operating under the command of General Von Werder. These now appear to be massed chiefly in and around Dijon and Gray, to have fortified Montbéliard and invested Auxonne, and to hold by their advanced posts a line extending from Dôle, on the Doubs, through St. Jean de Losne, on the Saône, to Nuits, at the foot of the Côte d'Or. The troops opposed to them, under General Garibaldi, in the vicinity of Autun and Creuzot, are reported to be in a state of paralyzing disorganization, owing to a want of harmony between the French and foreign officers, and a mutinous spirit among the men. Telegrams

from Tours, however, announce a sanguinary surprise of a German detachment, at Châtillon (Châtillon-le-Duc, near Besançon?), by Ricciotti Garibaldi, and also an obstinate, though indecisive, combat near Nuits, between three hundred Francs-tireurs against four times their number of Prussians. The news from the southern parts of France is considered in Tours to be more satisfactory than it has been for a time, order being re-established both in Lyons and Marseilles. In the North frequent fighting, though on a rather small scale, has been going on in the Department of Aisne, around Tergnier and La Fère, mostly with advantage to the Prussians, who are, besides, soon to receive heavy reinforcements, under General Manteuffel. The garrison of the last-named place has made some vigorous sorties, but in vain. More or less successful sorties are also reported from Mézières, Montmédy, and Belfort. From Paris there is no new warlike move to be recorded, attempted either by the besieged or by the besiegers.

According to all present appearance, General D'Aurelles de Paladines runs imminent risk of sharing the fate of the "Man of Sedan" and of Bazaine, unless he gets out of the way. A little too much tenacity—and this he is not at all unlikely to be forced into displaying—in trying to cover Tours—and Prince Frederic Charles will certainly "gobble him up," and that will be the end of "the Army of the Loire." Prudence seems to dictate a rapid removal of it and the Government to Poitiers, and, indeed, it is not at all unlikely that we shall hear of its flight within a few days. The fifteenth of December is now fixed, upon the best evidence, as the latest period Paris can hold out, but its surrender before the last moment is to be hoped for on grounds of humanity. Most intelligent Frenchmen have doubtless given up hope; but there is a state of mind which succeeds hopefulness into which great numbers of them are now passing, and which is perhaps respectable enough to take the guilt out of vain resistance, and that is a state of mind in which fighting on, without reference to result, seems a duty. There is, however, evidently not much of this. Most of the obstinacy is evidently due to ignorance and vanity and absurd expectations.

Count Bismarck has carried the negotiations with the representatives of the South-western States, relative to their union with North Germany, to a successful issue, though not in a way which can be said to be perfectly satisfactory to all parties concerned. The Grand-Duchies of Baden and Hesse-Darmstadt have joined the North German Confederation unconditionally, and the treaty admitting them as members has been signed at Versailles. To the two kingdoms of Württemberg and Bavaria, however, concessions had to be made by King William, such as, perhaps, only the prolonged resistance of Paris, Von der Tann's check before Orléans, and the war clouds rising in the East, have persuaded him to grant. Württemberg has secured special reservations in regard to its internal taxes, mails, and telegraphs, and Bavaria is even allowed to retain—in addition, we presume—"its military sovereignty and independent military organization"—under the supremacy, of course, of the Hohenzollern head of the thus enlarged Union, to whom, also, all representation abroad exclusively belongs. The conventions concluded will be laid before the North German Parliament, as well as a draft, which is now under consideration, of a new federal constitution. Thus Germany—in its narrower sense, that is, with the exclusion of the German provinces of the Austro-Hungarian Empire—may be said to be finally united. Whether its head is to wear the imperial crown is as yet not stated. The result of the recent elections to the Prussian Diet shows increased confidence in the Government. Dr. Jacoby, of Königsberg, the chief opponent to its annexation schemes, has been defeated.

The most prominent topic of discussion connected with the war during the week has been the question of Bazaine's treachery. It was first raised by Gambetta when he heard of the surrender of Metz, but,

as far as he was concerned, was a pure falsehood, invented to support other falsehoods which he had been previously telling about Bazaine's cutting his way out to Thionville, and holding Prince Frederic Charles as in a vice. He knew nothing whatever of the facts at the time he issued his proclamation, and Bazaine, in a letter to *Le Nord*, a Belgium paper, very properly pronounced the War Minister's charges "lying lucubrations." Since the surrender, "reports" and statements of various kinds have been flying about in every direction, throwing doubts on the Marshal's fidelity. The testimony as to the abundance of food during the siege is very strong; but, on the other hand, the testimony as to the broken-down and, above all, scorbutic appearance of the soldiers, except the Guard, at the surrender, is equally strong; and this would seem to dispose of the report that the Marshal refused to cut the rations down. His excuse for not cutting his way out is, that he had no artillery horses; but it is said, on the other hand, that he ought to have tried his luck before the horses were eaten up. But he did try it twice, and the heads of his columns were swept away by the Prussian fire long before they reached the besieging lines. The other plans by which he might have got out if he had tried, with which the newspapers are filled, are hardly worth discussing. The number of men who can extricate any army from any scrape, if you only give them a quire of paper, is prodigious, but it is hardly fair to condemn any soldier on their certificates. The theory on which Bazaine is accused is, of course, that he was hostile to the Republic, and wished to save the Empire; and that he expected the Provisional Government to make peace after Sedan, and then he would march out the only unconquered leader. There may be something in this, and there may not. One is prejudiced against it by the fact that Gambetta has accused all the officers of the regular army of treasonable devotion to the "Man of Sedan." If the French army was what he describes it, his trying to make a new one was a crime. He ought to make peace, and go to work to get up a new code of national morals.

The cloud of war raised by Gortchakoff's circular has not altogether passed away. Earl Granville has opposed a peremptory refusal to the Russian application for a revision of the Treaty of 1856, on the ground that, however unreasonable the restrictions placed on Russia may be, one party to the treaty is not to be permitted to throw off the obligations it imposes without the consent of the others—using arguments with which the discussion of the State-rights question in this country has made most American readers familiar, but which probably strike English readers now as much more forcible than they did in 1861. To this Gortchakoff replies, that the treaty has been already violated two or three times by the intrusion of war vessels into the Black Sea, and by the election of a Prince by the united provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia, and that, in any event, it is impossible just now to summon a congress, so he must have his war vessels in that sea without further delay; but he is conciliatory in tone, and disclaims all hostility to Turkey. There would be a stronger probability of a peaceful settlement than there is, and we do not say that such a settlement is yet improbable, if England could afford to yield; but owing to the terrible damage sustained by her reputation through her submissiveness about the Danish question, and the singular readiness which Prussia has shown to quarrel with her over the exportation of arms, she will doubtless have to fight, *nolens volens*, to save herself from contempt or worse. If Austria kept out of the fray, war would probably be remote, but she must go into it as a matter of life, and Italy's attitude is still doubtful, but she will probably be tempted by the glory of the thing and anxiety to make her debut as a first-class power. The chances of peace, however, improve with delay, and if the negotiations can be kept going till the fall of Paris, a general congress will furnish the disputants a ready escape from a very embarrassing position.

The serious character which the Russian affair evidently at one time assumed in the eyes of European finance and commerce, was reflected here in an advance of four per cent. in gold, a slight fall in

Government bonds and in cotton, and a rapid and excited advance in breadstuffs. More than one-half of these changes has, however, been lost again, and so far the influence on our markets has been extremely limited. It would be difficult to furnish a better illustration of the listlessness, or rather total absence, of speculation. Stocks have, in the main, been lower, in spite of various combination schemes. Money continues easy, but with occasional evidences of a diminution in general confidence, which is not altogether without justification. Several failures in the whiskey trade, and others both abroad and at home, create a certain amount of uneasiness. The woollen and iron trades complain of depression, and several mills and foundries have temporarily stopped work, while, at the same time, strikes are reported in various directions. Coal continues dull and weak, though without material decline. The condition of the real-estate market is attracting renewed attention, owing largely to the poor success of an attempted auction sale of a large amount of choice city property. Business generally, though light, is sound and steady, and appears to be settling down more and more to the quiet dulness of extreme regularity.

The Spaniards have at last got a king in the person of the young Duke of Aosta, and it must be confessed that, although he is not a person of remarkable ability, nor likely to have much power, he has in him, in having been bred at a constitutional court, the materials of the best ruler the Spaniards have had for many a long day. That any great change in the character of the Government will take place soon is not to be hoped for; this must come, not from a change in the dynasty, or rearrangement of the machinery, but from the spread of education and growth of industry. If the new régime makes roads and establishes schools, it will do all that can, for the present, be expected of it. If the Spaniards could only have picked Aosta out six months ago, what millions of treasure and torrents of blood would have been saved; and yet how much less hopeful and satisfactory the state of Europe would have been than it now promises to be.

The Cox controversy has been slowly dying out in spite of a feeble supplemental "explanation" from the President, which contains nothing new. It will probably now remain where it is till Mr. Cox's report appears next month. This will, we believe, furnish some tid-bits about the condition of the civil service in Washington. The *Philadelphia Press* has, however, we are glad to say, continued its onslaughts on civil service reform. Colonel Forney declares of it that "it is a self-evident falsehood," and "fraud upon the government," and that "the American people will none of it." Yes, they will—begging the Colonel's pardon—and, what is more startling still, the Colonel himself will yet defend it fiercely in his own terse English, in this same paper. The *Indianapolis Journal* has also taken up the same ground, and abuses Cox handsomely. It says, by way of defending "rotation in office," that the new clerks form a kind of "investigating committee," and find out what tricks their predecessors have been guilty of. This is certainly true up to a certain point, but then as soon as the "investigating committee" has discovered the tricks, the members begin to practise them themselves, which makes it difficult to see what the country gains by having them found out. The *Boston Advertiser*, too, has come to the defence of the President, and says there is nothing whatever in the charges against him; that he is all right, and that his assailants ought to be ashamed of themselves. All his defenders, however, would have done well to have followed the example of the best and shrewdest newspaper friends he has—the *New York Times* and *Tribune*—and have preserved a strict silence about the whole matter. That is the best way to confound the "Coxites." The *Tribune*, by the way, did speak once. Mr. Lewis Dent, the President's brother-in-law, and one of the McGarrahan counsel, having been accused by somebody of having gone to Long Branch to procure the McGarrahan letter, denied it. Whereupon the *Tribune* called attention to his denial, and said the public might judge, from the way this charge had broken down, of the value of the attacks recently made on the President.

There is one thing this controversy reveals pretty clearly, and that is, that the amount of support which the friends of reform will receive on the matter of civil service from men, and even from journalists, who have ever held office, and who expect to hold it again, will be very small. They are all in favor of civil service reform in the abstract, but when it comes to taking any practical steps to bring it about, as Rip Van Winkle says, "they swear off." But the recent uproar has at least developed a show of zeal, and Mr. Boutwell has been driven into publishing a circular issued by him for the government of the custom-houses, in June, 1869, which directs a *bona-fide* examination of every candidate for a place, and a competitive examination where there are several candidates for one place; and the Boston *Advertiser* says "it is assured that similar instructions have been given, and are enforced, in every bureau under Mr. Boutwell's control." We are glad this astounding assertion has been made, because it will give the friends of reform an opportunity either of doing justice to a much maligned man, or calling public attention in a very telling way to the nature of the devices by which attempts to bring about real reform are foiled. But we venture to predict that Mr. Boutwell will sorely regret having made it before he hears the last of it. He has uncovered his flank.

Indeed, there seems to be a general agreement among the supporters of the new régime at Washington, from the President down—well, to say things which put the public in a very embarrassing position. For instance, we now have three different reasons given us in succession why General Grant interfered with the course of law about the McGarrahan claim. The first was that he had "suspicions of Wilson;" the second, that he wished to reserve the matter to be disposed of by Congress; the third—evidently suggested by Butler, who puts it forward in his late letter—that he wanted to keep the property for the United States. Among the numerous collateral fabrications got up in aid of the Administration, and one of the most impudent, is the story that the signers of the New Haven letter are sorry, and, if it was to be done over again, would not sign. The reasons for writing such a letter have indeed grown stronger by far under the President's defence than they were when it was written. We think we can safely promise all who have sympathized with Mr. Cox, and supported him, a set of "exposures" during the coming winter which will make him seem more remarkable for forbearance than for anything else.

General Butler has appeared on the scene during the week in two characters. One is as a witness in the Cox case. He testifies as a Member of the Judiciary Committee that the McGarrahan claim was not well founded, but adds that Cox seemed to him "quite desirous apparently to give a patent to the Idria Mining Company," the whole letter, we have little doubt, being written for the express purpose of bringing this insinuation in, which, of course, has just what force the character of the person who makes it gives it, and no more. He is also coming out as a lecturer on the *Alabama* case, but repudiates the report of an "interview" with him, which went the rounds of the papers a week ago, and in which he said the Republican party was going to the dogs, and would die unless "capital" was made for it; and that the way to make capital for it was to get up a quarrel with England about the *Alabama* case and the fisheries. Finding this did not take well with the public, he denies its accuracy, and says he is going to explain himself more fully; but the New York *Tribune* tells him that it will prove that the report *was* accurate, and that he must be careful. The spectacle of a Christian public buzzing about a personage like the General, waiting for his "views" on war and peace and political morality, is not pleasant even when one knows how small his influence is.

A well-informed correspondent writes to say he thinks we have overestimated the strength of the "Labor Reformers" in the recent election in Massachusetts. He says the Phillips vote was largely made up of Republican malcontents, who gave them to Mr. Phillips instead of Mr. "Scattering," and that this element would have been much larger but for his speeches. The best test of the strength of the Prohibitionists and Labor Reformers was to be found in the vote for the Lieu-

tenant-Governor, in which the former polled, less three towns, 6,475; the latter, 9,454—in all, 15,929. Take this from the total vote, and we have a residuum of 5,817, composed of Republican discontent, which Mr. Phillips's speeches had not been sufficient to dissipate, although towards the close of the canvass, under the influence of a severe punching from Mr. Bird, he became quite philosophical and soared into the upper air of reason, in which he says he usually dwells. *Persons* don't interest him or attract his attention; and when he does notice them, he is always careful to state the naked unadorned truth about them. When he said, for instance, in the late canvass, that the Springfield *Republican* had acted as the "tool of Vanderbilt" in its opposition to the Hartford and Erie swindle, let no one suppose that he invented that story on the spot as a good, spiteful, telling thing to say of a troublesome opponent. Far from it; Vanderbilt must have submitted to him proof of the whole transaction, the very agreement, and the sum paid to the *Republican* as the reward of its corruption, or Mr. Phillips would never have given circulation to the charge. We hope the moral of the whole affair will not now be lost sight of. It is the danger of allowing one's self, no matter how highly gifted, to become a mere Tongue, and go about wagging and wagging for the popular entertainment, without regard to memory or judgment or conscience. No Tongue can be trusted to behave properly if left to itself in this way. It is sure to get into a scrape and disgrace itself, no matter how silvery it is or how much people like listening to it. We are sorry to say, however, loose, masterless Tongues are multiplying; we hope this Boston scrimmage will scare some of them home and make them see the propriety of taking service under good, honest brains.

It turns out that the amendment validating—conditionally, as we showed last week—the municipal railroad bonds in Michigan, has been defeated by a majority rising 20,000; and that in fact the only amendments which were carried were those providing for legislative regulation of railroad charges, and prohibiting the consolidation of competing lines of railway. Even the word "white," no longer anything more than a superfluity in the constitution, was ordered to be kept standing by a majority of about three thousand votes, neither party polling its full strength over this issue. Nothing is more capricious than the fate of amendments in this country, but the public apathy in regard to them may be counted on if they do not involve party issues, or, as in Michigan, touch directly the voters' pockets. The usual striking disparity between the vote for candidates and the vote on amendments submitted at the same election, may be taken, on the one hand, to prove the exaggerated estimate of the value of such amendments as instruments of progress; and, on the other, of the unthinking, almost purely personal, character of our politics. If anything like the pains were taken to enlighten the people as to the nature and reasons of these changes which are devoted to party abuse and the blackening of reputations, there would be less frequent need of tinkering our constitutions, and they would prove about as serviceable at one date as another.

While New Hampshire has lost in population during the last decade, the Southern States which participated in the rebellion have all increased, however slightly. In material condition they are fully as well off as in 1860, and their prospects are indefinitely better, and devoid of all illusion. They are no longer to be pitied or sympathized with, or pointed out as examples of the effect of Yankee rapacity and tyranny. They have, to be sure, a carpet-bag legacy which is not to be got rid of in a moment, but which they are as rapidly disowning as circumstances will permit. They need now, more than anything, an influx of emigrants which shall give them something like their due ratio of inhabitants to the square mile; and they would do well, we think, to imitate such a combination as that of the North-western States, whose governors met in convention on Wednesday to see what could be done towards putting immigration upon a national basis. The experiment of placing Chinamen at the South seems to have been self-limiting, and is no longer depended upon as a panacea. At the North it is found difficult to obtain a supply of this kind of labor equal to the demand, and the "Chinese problem" has been postponed without day. The negroes have in the meantime been multiplying instead of dying off.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION.

THERE has been a good deal of uproar during the week in the political arena, arising partly out of the audaciously insubordinate tone of the Gratz-Brown Republicans in Missouri, partly out of the indignation caused in the Republican ranks by Mr. Cox's resignation, and partly by certain articles in the *Chicago Tribune*, indicating a belief that the Republican party was falling far short of satisfying the needs of the times, and that some new organization would have to take its place, and hinting that the Democratic party had what the Republican party has not, and yet what any party must have to command the popular confidence—something positive in its policy—on the tariff question, for instance. The *New York Evening Post* has increased the tumult by a summing up of the results of the late elections, which shows that while in 1868 and 1869 ten Southern States were Republican, and only six Democratic, in the elections this fall only two are Republican, three have not voted, and the remainder, which are now Democratic, were two years ago Republican. The *Post* draws the conclusion that things are not in a good way with the Republican party when the scales can thus be turned against it in regions in which the influence of the Administration is unusually powerful. The *New York Tribune*, which is a firm supporter of the Administration, replies on the other hand that the *Post* is a base and cunning deceiver; that the reason why some of the Southern States have gone against the Administration is, that since the last election the rebel element in their population has been enfranchised; why others have gone is "the improvident and profligate" local legislation of the Republicans; but it admits the main fact—and that is, that for one reason or another the result is pretty much what the *Post* has described—viz., the States in question are now Democratic, instead of being, as they were, Republican.

There is no comfort to be got from the fact, if fact it be, that the Democratic majorities at the South are due to the readmission to the franchise of "ex-rebels." The important point for consideration is, that the "ex-rebels" are in, and cannot be got out; and that any party which hereafter proposes to administer the Government of the United States will have to take notice of their presence and of their power. The Republican party will have either to secure strength enough elsewhere to defy them or to win them over. The last it is certainly not at all likely to do; can it do the first?

The answer to this question, of course, will depend in the main on the amount of importance one attaches to the dissatisfaction which is showing itself in the party ranks at the North. There is no disguising the fact that there is a widespread belief, which grows stronger every week, that the party is sharing the fate of all parties which have been long in the enjoyment of great power, and has become deeply tainted with corruption. This impression has been greatly deepened and diffused during the past few weeks by the revelation that some of its most notorious and oldest "corruptionists" have risen into favor and influence at the White House, and are able to make the departments too hot for their enemies. The gravity of this fact is aggravated in the public mind by the circumstance that these worthies are "Pennsylvania politicians"—a species on which the country has long looked as something unrivalled in its line, and whose attempts on the President when he came into office filled all his best friends with alarm. Besides the distrust which springs from this source, and which is exceedingly strong amongst a large class who, though they do not call at newspaper offices "to talk things over," show themselves in considerable force on election day, there is a feeling, perhaps less respectable than the one we have been discussing, but which, nevertheless, has its weight, and which may be best described as weariness of the party and its works. People are growing rapidly tired of "its glorious record;" they are growing tired, too, of its "economy" and of "its fidelity to the great principles," etc. They ought not to grow tired of these things, but they do. The number of those who have a slight sensation of nausea when they hear an orator touching on them is increasing alarmingly. There is a growing demand for something more positive, something that promises more immediate results in the way of increasing people's comfort and giving them objects of active interest, than Mr. Boutwell's purchases for the

Sinking Fund. The prospect of funding at a lower rate of interest, too, appears to many too small to be even worth discussion. The party is absolutely suffering, not from apathy, but from *ennui*. It is literally being *bored* to death by its managers.

We say it is not suffering from apathy in any proper sense of the word, because we doubt whether eagerness for reform, and for energetic reform, was ever so widespread as it is at this moment. People have recovered from the excitement of the war against slavery, and have begun to look closely about them, and the state of things which meets their eyes is by no means satisfactory. They find themselves saddled with a tariff of extraordinary complexity, which touches thousands of articles, and is full of snares and absurdities; they find that, though its supporters declare it to be the best tariff that ever was, it is taken up every winter regularly by these very persons, and overhauled from top to bottom, tinkered and patched and modified, under the instigation of a powerful and insatiable lobby, to the great disturbance of business, and to the serious injury of the national industry. They find the collection of the national revenue—that is, the transaction of the national business—committed to a body of men from whom not only no guarantees as to character or capacity are exacted, but who are furnished by the very nature of the system under which they are appointed with every conceivable temptation to dishonesty and idleness; and they are told by a competent observer that about a fourth of the national income is stolen or lost in the process of collection. They find the State legislatures, especially in the East, becoming, one by one, terribly corrupt, and passing rapidly under the control of the great "rings" of wealthy and unscrupulous jobbers, whose combinations are taking complete possession of all the great joint-stock enterprises, the railroads, telegraphs, expresses, and rising rapidly above the jurisdiction of the courts. They find the character of the judiciary seriously deteriorating in the very regions in which judicial integrity is of most consequence—the great centres of wealth and population. They find the schools, the prisons, the charities of the country, gradually slipping away from the hands of the men who make these things the object of humane and scientific pursuit, and passing more and more into the hands of political charlatans, to whom a school or prison or workhouse is only interesting as a place in which they can find places for a certain number of party hacks. They find, too, that in these, as well as in the post-office and various other important branches of administration, the separation between the intellect of the nation and the practice of the art of government is growing yearly wider, and that in many of them Europe, which once copied us, has far surpassed us. The condition of the prison of Sing-Sing would fill any European jailer with horror. Our post-office is a mediæval contrivance compared to the British, and our schools fall far below those of Germany in the *quality* of the instruction and in the proportion of the national children which they lay hold of and train. The institutions which are rapidly gaining, not in wealth only but in power and efficiency, are the universities, but this is unanimously ascribed to the providential arrangement which has deprived the Government of control over them.

Behind all this, we have the nation growing rapidly in knowledge, skill, riches, and ambition—its experience widened, and judgment strengthened, and perceptions sharpened, by the tremendous contest from which it has just emerged; and when its best men look about for work to do in the setting of its affairs to rights, they find the only thing that offers is the blowing of a blast against alcohol and tobacco, or the composition of weak drivel on female suffrage. If anybody supposes people are content with this state of things, or will long put up with any party which offers them no way out of it, but asks them to content themselves with the contemplation of Mr. Boutwell's Sinking Fund, or the increased receipts from the whiskey tax, he is greatly mistaken.

What will be the result of this dissatisfaction as regards either the Republican or Democratic parties, it would as yet be hard to determine, and we doubt if anybody is competent to throw much light on the subject. Those who flatter themselves that they will find in the Democratic party the reformatory spirit and agencies that they seek, have as yet not shown any good grounds for their faith. We have yet to see the slightest sign of a progressive tendency in that

quarter. Its declarations in favor of free trade strike one rather as little balloons sent up to ascertain how the wind is blowing, than proof of a hearty adoption of a financial policy. For civil service reform, or any other reform, it has not yet said one word. Wherever it holds the reins, its corruption surpasses anything hitherto seen in that field. Moreover, we doubt whether any party ever has departed or can depart in its policy from its essential principle, and the essential principle of the Democratic party is hostility to change. It has existed for nearly twenty years simply to resist change; to ask it now to become an instrument of change, and of great and sweeping change, is asking something which its very nature forbids. Its muscles are not made for that kind of work. Its strength lies in holding on or standing still.

Whether a reformer will fare any better in the Republican party still remains to be seen. The only thing certain thus far is that, if it means to exist, it must move on, that it cannot continue to live on Democratic baseness and the glories of its own record, that it must provide positive reforms. But we doubt much whether it is as yet the duty of reformers to trouble their heads with the consideration of the question whether it *will* provide positive reforms, or what will happen if it does not. If they succeed in so working on public opinion as to make the demand for reform loud and imperative, either the Republican party will satisfy it, or else something will rise up in its place that will satisfy it. It is for the friends of reform just now to sow the seed; but there is no occasion to squat down, and watch for the sprouting of the corn, or to vex themselves about the supply of reapers.

THE TURCO-RUSSIAN TROUBLE.

It has been believed for some time that there existed an understanding between Prussia and Russia, by which the latter was to be permitted to get what advantage she could out of the Franco-Prussian struggle, as long as she did not interfere in it herself, or permit interference in it on the part of any other power. Accordingly, she has had no hesitation in letting it be known that if Austria meddled in it she would meddle too, though probably not on the same side, and that she would certainly expect a revision of the Treaty of 1856 as one of the consequences of the war. The only thing about which there has been any doubt in diplomatic circles has been the time and manner in which she would present her demand for a removal of the restrictions on her in the Black Sea. It had been generally supposed that she would not take any steps in the matter till the close of the war; and the sudden appearance of Prince Gortchakoff's note, and, above all, its somewhat peremptory tone, have, therefore, created something like a panic on the European exchanges.

There are, however, various strong reasons for believing that the matter will either be arranged peacefully now, or that, if it is not arranged peacefully at once, war will not come of it immediately. In the first place, it appears probable that England, if she has to fight, will not fight alone, as a good many people have supposed, and that, even if she were to contribute no land forces to the fray, Russia would still be confronted by 700,000 or 800,000 Austrians, Turks, and Italians, who, instead of having to assail Russia, always a difficult task, would simply have to await her onslaught; and for offensive operations the Russian army has in these later days shown singular incapacity. Austria, too, torn as she is by domestic dissensions, and with a financial status of unusual complexity and embarrassment, is really more formidable as a military power than she has been at any time in the last half-century. Her army has been reorganized; the popularity of the reigning Emperor is greater than any member of his family has enjoyed since Maria Theresa; she has no Italy; and, what is more important than all for military purposes, Hungary is not only loyal and devoted, but may be said to manage the resources of the empire. The great source of the military weakness of Austria, next after the possession of Italy, during the last half-century, may thus be said to be removed; and Hungary owes Russia a grudge which would give unusual bitterness to a contest with her. What the effect of the Pan-Slavic idea, and of the differences with Austria on the score of administrative autonomy, would have on Bohemia and Croatia, it is hard to say with any certainty, but it seems safe to conclude that absorption in such a tremendous centralization as

Russia would be fully as repulsive to them as subjection to German and Hungarian domination. From the latter there is good hope of deliverance; from the former there would be none. With Austria, too, the struggle would be one of life and death. The appearance of the Russians at Constantinople would mean for her, since the events of 1866, total and rapid destruction, and would mean for all the Danubian races the complete extinction of the hopes of separate national existence, which have been growing rapidly amongst them since 1856, and which have almost entirely superseded the abject fear of the Turks which made former attacks on Turkey by Russia so welcome. Whatever the attitude the Bosniacks, Bulgarians, and Servians, or Moldo-Wallachians, might take up towards Turkey, in case of a convulsion in Eastern Europe, there is not much probability at present that it would lead them into an active support of Russia; and without their active support, or even with it but in the absence of the control of the Black Sea, an advance on Constantinople is, we repeat, impossible—and the Russian generals of course know this better than anybody else. Whatever power holds the Black Sea can throw an army in the rear of any force attacking Constantinople in a few days by steam. In other words, the conditions under which the last invasion of Turkey took place, in 1828, are completely changed, and for the worse, and that one was very near ending in disaster. In short, a war now would very much resemble the war of 1854, minus the battle of Alma and the siege of Sebastopol.

The demand of Russia that the Black Sea be again thrown open to her fleets is one, therefore, which it seems to be in the power of England or Turkey to grant or refuse. There are only two ways of introducing a Russian fleet into it—one is by building and launching it, and the other is by bringing it up the Dardanelles. The story of the fifty iron-clad monitors ready for sea at Nicolaieff is still only a story—probably issued in support of the negotiations, though there is no doubt that dockyards exist there. The work of building a fleet is, even if the facilities for it existed, one of years, and entrance by the Dardanelles by force would of course be out of the question. Indeed, one of the first results of the outbreak of hostilities would probably be the disappearance of the Russian fleet from the Mediterranean and Baltic, to take refuge under the fortifications. All this leads us to the conclusion that Russia will not attempt to solve the problem by force; and this view seems to be strongly confirmed by both of the Gortchakoff despatches. He is very careful to repudiate all intention or desire of reopening the "Eastern Question" or menacing the independence of Turkey, and evidently hopes to attain his object rather by exciting uneasiness than by an actual resort to force.

As regards the legitimacy of the Russian demands, there can be no doubt that the point made by Earl Granville, that it is not permissible for one of the parties to a treaty to release himself from its obligations whenever he is pleased to declare it no longer binding on him, is well taken. Any other doctrine would make all treaties a mere formality, and would give international agreements very much the same character as Mrs. Cady Stanton's marriages. Indeed, there would be something ridiculous in carrying on negotiations for the mere purpose of getting the parties to agree to do this, or refrain from that, as long as they thought proper. Where nobody is bound, there is no contract; and nobody is bound in any transaction who retains the right to act in accordance with his own inclination. It may be said that all treaties are broken, sooner or later, by the refusal of one of the parties to abide by them; but then there is a wide difference between saying that they have not all the force they ought to have, and saying they have none at all. The theory, too, that the observance of a treaty imposed by force ought not to be expected after the vanquished feels strong enough to abrogate it, if generally adopted, which we are glad to say it is not likely to be, would give a peculiarly horrible character to war. In fact, we see in the case of France a striking illustration of its practical working. It is the firm belief of the Germans that France, in her rage and mortification, will not abide by any terms that may be imposed on her by the conqueror one minute longer than she can help, which drives them into weakening her by every means in their power, and which is put forward by Germans as the principal justification of the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine. A similar policy would be pur-

sued under similar circumstances in other cases. Every victor, knowing he could expect neither peace nor security from the plighted faith of the vanquished, would devote himself, might and main, to the work of dismemberment and destruction, so that, however much the enemy might wish to attack him again, as long a time as possible should elapse before he had the ability to do so. Wars would thus be indefinitely prolonged, and their evils greatly aggravated. The doctrine is, however, absurd as well as impolitic. A power which appeals to arms for the decision of a controversy, *ipso facto* pledges itself to abide by the decision when fairly ascertained. If the sword did not play the part of an arbiter, and its decisions were not accepted as those of an arbiter in the forum of international law, war would be simple savagery, in most respects far more revolting than the conflicts of wild animals. It is a means—a horrible and barbarous means, we admit—of defining the relations in which political communities should live to each other. If people who appeal to it, as Russia did in 1853, and as France did in July last, say when they are beaten that they will not be bound by its decisions unless their antagonist keeps his foot on their necks, their fighting stands on the same moral level as the scratching and biting of a parcel of tom-cats.

On the other hand, both in imposing terms of peace and in insisting on their observance, allowance has, as in all other things, to be made for the weaknesses of human nature. It does not do to impose too severe a strain on people's pride, particularly when they believe they have the means of protecting themselves against humiliation. There is no doubt that the Russian arsenals and dockyards at Sebastopol were prepared, through long years, for the purpose of assailing Turkey. The Black Sea fleet which was destroyed at Sebastopol was too outrageously disproportioned to any danger of attack which the Russian coast ran in that quarter, to make all talk of it as a protection anything but absurd. Its destruction was therefore a legitimate object and necessary result of a war undertaken to repel an attack on Turkey, and the neutralization of the Black Sea was as good a means as could have been devised of getting rid of the danger for some time afterwards. It would be well for mankind if every sea and ocean in the world could be neutralized in the same way. But it was and is useless to expect that the present generation of Russians, which is undoubtedly more occupied with the work of internal reform and development than with the solution of "the Eastern question," and which certainly does not buoy itself up with the fanatical hopes with regard to the possession of the Bosphorus which the Emperor Nicholas cherished and diffused, and made it the business of his life to try to realize, will quietly sit down much longer under a restriction of which the reasonableness is less apparent than when it was imposed, and which, in depriving a great power of the right to keep armed vessels in a sea which is half enclosed by its territory, is a standing humiliation. The greater the humiliation, too, for Russia, the more necessary it was for the other signatories to avoid even such formal and technical breaches of the Treaty of 1856 as the entrance of armed vessels in the cortège of the Sultan and Prince of Wales and Emperor of Austria. The point raised with regard to Roumania is of the same character—technical, but in the mouth of a proud nation strong. The whole matter can and will, we have little doubt, be arranged by a general congress; but no arrangement of it will be final or successful which does not set up at Constantinople a government which has some moral claim to respect. It is the utter absence of any such claim on the part of Turkey which makes the pretensions of Russia really dangerous. Nobody who has any hopes for the political and social future of the vigorous races which people her European territory can wish to see them handed over to Russia, whose system, good enough for herself, is after all a Cæsarism, with a touch of "divine right" in it, and which, set up in the Levant, would blight regions whose share in European civilization is only beginning, and to whom the very *insouciance* and shiftlessness of their Turkish masters have given already a remarkable amount of training in self-government.

THE FEUD IN THE WOMAN'S RIGHTS CAMP.

WE spoke some weeks ago of the advanced ground taken up by the *Revolution*, the New York organ of the Woman's Rights Movement, with

regard to the ballot; it relegated it to a subordinate position in the list of rights, and treated it as simply a means to the general emancipation of the sex. We also spoke of the still more advanced position taken up by Mrs. Cady Stanton, the mother of the movement. She is, she declares, in favor of unlimited freedom of divorce—that is, to all intents and purposes, the abolition of the marriage contract—for where there is no bond, there is no contract. We also spoke of the doctrine put forth by the *Woman's Advocate*—an interesting and ingenious periodical, sometime published at Dayton, Ohio, but lately merged in the *Woman's Journal* of Boston—that marriages might, with great advantage, be contracted for limited periods, say two or three years, leaving their renewal to depend on the pleasure of the parties. When we spoke of all these things, we little thought that they were soon to become the cause of a savage encounter between the New York and Boston organs. We were the less prepared for it, as we were ourselves sharply rebuked by the *Journal*, and even accused of fraud, for having allowed a lady to say in our columns, what we had already said ourselves, that the movement must inevitably touch upon the questions of marriage and divorce, and that no attempt to deal with woman's condition in society can pass these questions by. The *Woman's Journal* repelled these insinuations with all sorts of unpleasant remarks. Within a very short time—we will not be so cruel as to say how short—we found the same paper rebuking the New York brethren and sisters for touching "marriage, divorce, and deficiency of offspring;" but we still supposed that some means would be found of repairing the breach.

But things went on from bad to worse. The *Journal* has at last denounced Mrs. Stanton, and shows in an article which there is no confuting that free divorce means free love, and free love means "free lust." The *Revolution* replies in a savage attack on the *Journal*, and says there is "free love" in this enterprise also, owing to its absorption of the *Woman's Advocate* aforementioned. Mrs. Stanton, too, publishes a scathing letter on the Boston branch, and is especially cutting in her remarks on Colonel T. W. Higginson, who, she says, is the real head of the concern, Henry Ward Beecher being a mere man of straw. Considering what mighty interests are imperilled by this unseemly quarrel, we must say that we think it was a little premature for the New York branch to send a female "peace advocate and commissioner" to Bismarck and Jules Favre, and for Mrs. Howe, of the Boston branch, to "declare war" against the former because he would not make peace with the French on her terms. Think of what unholy merriment there will be at the Prussian headquarters when the recent numbers of the *Revolution* and *Woman's Journal* are laid on the breakfast table, and the King's aid-de-camp translates the leading articles to the assembled company. Fancy how Von Moltke's ribs will shake when he hears his brother-warrior, Colonel Higginson, described by a fellow-laborer as "a neat and dapper reformer and rhetorician, and an *ex cathedra* authority on dress, manners, and culinary utensils." A nice reception "Mrs. Emilie J. Merriam" will find awaiting her now when she is brought in from the outposts by the Uhlans, "with her grave considerations of peace." Humanity may well veil its face and wail when it thinks upon these things.

But we confess that, although we think the *Journal's* doctrines about marriage are the sound ones, we have no doubt that Mrs. Stanton's are the more popular, and that the *Revolution* has a far mightier future before it than its Boston contemporary. The reason is obvious. The *Revolution* and Mrs. Stanton have a distinct prospectus, and promise to make very important changes in woman's condition if they get a chance. A state of society in which a wife could any morning tell her husband she was going to leave him that day for good, or in which a husband could make a similar communication to his wife, without any fear of interference from the law or censure from their neighbors, as the exercise of a simple natural right, like the choice of clothes or perfumes, would, it must be admitted, be a state of society differing profoundly from any state of society with which the civilized world is at present familiar. But a state of society in which the number of voters, of platform orators, and of newspaper writers and readers was double what it is now would not, as it appears at present to the carnal eye, differ so much from that in which we live as to offer anything very attractive by way of change or variety; and this is all the *Woman's Journal* as yet promises to an afflicted and deluded world as the result of the success of its labors. To be sure, it mentions many great blessings as likely to flow from female suffrage, but then all its speculations have such a strictly *à priori* basis, are so entirely the product of the graceful imagination of the Boston Association, that the attention of the average man, and woman too, is too readily drawn off from them by the more substantial attractions offered by

the New Yorkers. In fact, the *Revolution's* plan has all the advantages for purposes of proselytism over the *Journal's* plan that Mahomet's paradise has over the Christian heaven. The advantage of having as many wives in succession as one pleases is obvious at a glance; the advantage of having the young men go to the polls with the girls, to the sound of music and amid the perfume of bouquets, is much more remote and shadowy. Moreover, the *Revolution* enjoys in its present advanced position the immense advantage of being more radical than its opponent. In the boundless field of *a priori* politics, the fastest runner always commands most popular favor, while the laggard, who picks his steps, and measures his paces, and sits down on the knolls to look about him, speedily becomes an object of distrust and even of contempt. To get and keep well in advance is indeed the one condition of success; and this condition, as it seems to us, the *Revolution*, and the *Revolution* only, fulfils. When you propose to give woman complete freedom, and yet leave the marriage contract binding, you mock all the wives of the land. When you proclaim your intention to make simple inclination from day to day the basis and the only basis, of the matrimonial relation, then you are indeed an emancipator; and this the *Revolution*, or, at least, Mrs. Cady Stanton, who leads the *Revolution*, does.

The *Woman's Journal*, on the other hand, promises us nothing but a generally improved condition of society as the result of women's participation in legislation. Now, whether women's participation in legislation will improve legislation will depend, as the most stupid can see, on the amount of knowledge, logic, good sense, patience, and self-control that women bring to the work. Accordingly, the public has been long looking for some better reason for believing that all the fine things the *Woman's Journal* predicts are really going to happen than the *Journal's* own assertion and that of the sages who appear at the Woman's Rights conventions. The thing in the nature of proof which it asks for most eagerly, is some specimens of woman's work in the shape of sober discussions of the questions of the day—in other words, the very questions with which women will have to deal when they come to legislate. It would like, for instance, to see a paper conducted solely by women not made up of cackle about "the progress of the cause," "words of cheer" from Hattie or Minnie, weak denunciations of tyrant man, hysterical rejoicings over Maggie V. P. Comstock's success as a lyceum lecturer, and high-flown eulogies on "love," but of thorough discussion of the subjects with which women will be called on to deal whenever they begin to vote, and with which it will be a great public calamity for them to deal without understanding them.

People, in short, in order to be convinced that the world is going to be the better of female suffrage, would like to hear from the leading women of the movement on the *Alabama* question, the fisheries question, the civil service question, the minority representation question, the tariff question, the labor question, the question of education, the judiciary question, the question of international arbitration, the question of neutral rights and duties; in short, the various questions over which the male mind of this nation and of the civilized world is just now sorely perplexed. If women are on all these matters to have an equal voice with men, let us, males say, have some specimens of their qualifications; don't let us flood our polls and legislatures with excitable busy-bodies and know-nothings, delicate in health, weak in the nerves, and deficient in self-control, and utterly ignorant of the considerations by which the strong and working half of the population of the globe is swayed. We have enough of these amongst ourselves already; and the task of governing the world is already too hard to make it desirable to make any rash experiments. Now it will not do, in answer to this reasonable and modest request, for one of our women's rights ladies to get up on a platform and talk as follows: "As regards the *Alabama* question, my opinion is that England in that matter was certainly wrong. She ought never to have let the *Alabama* sail; love should have been the guide of her conduct. It may be that some excuse may be found for her in the rules of what is called international law; but international law is a barbarous relic of the dark ages. The time has come for some new mode of regulating international relations, and the mothers, and sisters, and daughters, and wives, and nieces of the land, trust me, will supply it. The fishery question, it seems to me, is easy enough to settle, if men would only behave as they ought. I know nothing about your treaties. There have been too many man-made treaties already; but the three-mile rule is certainly a bad one; half-a-mile is enough for any rule; and I confess I have yet to hear any good reason why the hardy Cape Cod fisherman should not catch a cod where he pleases, in order to supply the wants of the wife and the little ones, who pray for him nightly as he tosses in his frail bark on the dangerous deep. The civil service question and the minority representation

question, much as they have puzzled the male mind, to woman's clearer perceptions present no difficulties whatever. All we have to do is to elect good men and good women to office; here is the real remedy for all defects in our civil service and our representative system. As regards the judiciary, a judge who consults his wife, and confides in the strength of her God-given intuitions, will never be led astray. Give him a pure and happy home, and a wife whose judgment he respects, not a drudge or a toy, and we shall hear no more of corruption or incompetency on the bench; nay, I will go further, and say, put his wife beside him on the bench, and then let us see if he will dare to give unjust decisions. [Tremendous applause—cries of 'that's the talk!'] Of international arbitration, I have only to say that it seems to me a good thing, though it will never be firmly established till woman gets the vote; and one needs not to be a Solon to know that neutrals, like all the rest of the world, ought to have their rights and to do their duties. The labor question owes its very existence to men's selfishness; if capitalists would obey the Golden Rule, and pay their laborers a fair day's wages for a fair day's work, there would be no labor question. Let the capitalist do this, and make no distinction in doing it between male and female labor; nay, let him, if he does make a distinction, take into consideration women's greater conscientiousness, and fidelity and purity, and all will be well."

"THE CHRISTIAN UNION" AND JUDGE CLERKE.

WE asked the *Christian Union*, a fortnight ago, to justify by citations the following passage in a late issue, in an article on "Our Judiciary":

"The press is moreover apt to be carried away by local excitement into sweeping and unfounded censures. Thus, some years ago, during a temporary panic, Judge Clerke, who was one of the most thoroughly honest and independent judges in this city, was virulently assailed for discharging a person accused of murder, and at a later period—indeed, up to this very time—the *Nation*, which we consider as usually a model of temperate criticism, has constantly spoken of certain acts of Judge Clerke in terms which nothing but a suspicion of corruption could justify. Yet the *Nation* very rightly favored his re-election within a month after he had committed these 'outrages,' as did all the Republican papers in the city. The fact was, of course, that the editor had never investigated the matter, and denounced as an act of villany a proceeding founded upon law and justice, simply because it was attended with disagreeable results."

It has responded as follows:

"THE 'NATION' AND JUDGE CLERKE.—Two weeks ago we said that the *Nation* had 'constantly spoken of certain acts of Judge Clerke in terms which nothing but a suspicion of corruption could justify.'

"The *Nation*, professing that well-deserved respect which we know it entertains for Judge Clerke, denies that it ever 'assailed or criticised him for any official act,' and thinks that we have made a grave mistake.

"Our language was well considered, and covered the precise ground, which the *Nation's* denial does not. We spoke from recollection only, but from a recollection too vivid to be mistaken. We are able to quote chapter and verse for one proof of our assertion. In No. 227 of the *Nation* (Nov. 4, 1869), the leading article opens as follows:

"The all but incredible prostitution of certain of our courts the recent utterly unjust and untenable injunctions against the Stock and Gold Boards and the Gold Exchange Bank, all issued by the men habitually spoken of by a certain class of people as 'our own judges,' are gradually producing the conviction in the minds of many men that . . . courts are specially provided to give the strong and the wicked an opportunity to oppress the weak and the honest."

"When this article was written, a full half of the injunctions thus specified as all issued by corrupt judges, had been issued by Judge Clerke, and at least one or two of them had been issued by Judge Brady, whose reputation is equally high.

"This seems to us to justify the exact terms in which we spoke, viz., that the *Nation* had constantly spoken of certain acts of Judge Clerke in terms which nothing but a suspicion of corruption could justify."

"Upon the merits of the fiscal management which asked for the injunctions, and upon the legal merits of the injunctions themselves, it is not necessary to enter. The simple question is, did the *Nation* speak of certain acts of Judge Clerke in terms which nothing but a suspicion of corruption could justify?"

The simple question is not "Did the *Nation* speak of certain acts of Judge Clerke," etc., but did it speak of certain acts as acts of Judge Clerke? In other words, in speaking of them, did it know them to be acts of Judge Clerke? and did it base on them a suspicion that Judge Clerke was corrupt, and did it commit the absurdity of recommending Judge Clerke for election after conceiving this suspicion? and has it "constantly, up to this very time," spoken of such acts as signs of corruption on the part of that gentleman, while all the while entertaining "a well-deserved respect" for him? We are sorry, on the *Christian Union's* account, to say that to every one of these questions a negative answer must be returned. The writer in that paper, in the first place, ought not to have made such

charges "from recollection only;" in the second place, his recollection was not "vivid" at all, but very defective, as is plain to be seen; in the third place, he ought to know that it is not permissible to bring against anybody a charge of constructive slander; in the fourth place, he has not got hold of the facts correctly. There were eight injunctions issued to our knowledge, when the article in question was written; of these, *six* were issued by Barnard and Cardozo, and *two* by Judge Clerke. That they were *all* unwarrantable and untenable, we thought then and think still; but the writer in the *Union* cannot have known we thought so, for we did not say it. He has assumed it; he also assumed that amongst the judges who issued unwarrantable and untenable injunctions, and who are called by a certain class "our own judges," we set down Judge Clerke. He had no right to assume anything of the kind. No mention being made of Judge Clerke's name, he was bound to give us the benefit of the doubt, and presume that we were simply guilty of making too sweeping a statement, and could not possibly have meant to include Judge Clerke amongst the judicial creatures of the Ring. He has, however, done worse than this; in order to fix upon us the charge of having had our eye on Judge Clerke especially, he says we have "constantly, and up to this very time, spoken of certain acts of Judge Clerke in terms," etc. We have done nothing of the kind. No mention of Judge Clerke's acts, as such, has been made in the *Nation* since November, 1869, nor any mention of Judge Clerke's name; nor any assertion, nor insinuation, nor innuendo that would lead any candid person to suppose that we suspected him of corruption. The injunctions were all discreditable performances. The granting of them on Judge Clerke's part was unquestionably the result of haste, as No. 2 enjoined a man who had been enjoined already. Barnard's and Cardozo's motives we need say nothing about. The writer in the *Christian Union* does not know "whether the proceeding was founded on law and justice," and ought not to have expressed any opinion about it. The injunctions were never argued, but all "settled" or withdrawn.

WHAT THE PRUSSIAN ARMY IS COMPOSED OF.

BERLIN, November 5.

IN compliance with your wish, I enter into the particulars of your correspondent "A. T.'s" queries about the Prussian military system, as propounded in No. 277, of October 20. The subject being one of general interest, I may be excused for reviewing more fully the whole ground which you very ably maintain.

The main questions and doubts of "A. T." and of the *Pall Mall Gazette* to be answered can be summed up as follows:

1. Does, according to you and other writers, the Prussian army in time of war absorb the best part of the male population: does it contain men of every profession and pursuit in about the same proportion in which they are found in civil life; or does, according to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, while admitting the superior military organization of the Prussians over the French, this organization only exist on paper, and is really only a fraction of all able-bodied men taken into service at the age of twenty?

2. Does, consequently, while war continues, society stand paralyzed; are the wheels of progress blocked; and are, on the other hand, the horrors of war mitigated and less disastrous to civilization; or is the Prussian army, like all others, principally composed of loafers, roughs, restless, shiftless, dissatisfied, unsuccessful men, who hail with delight a conjuncture like the present?

"A. T." winds up by asking the names of two statesmen, financiers, men of science, or scholars, now serving in the army, and by enquiring what the Prussians are going to do for bread to eat, clothes to wear, coal to burn, and other necessities of life, to say nothing of luxuries, if the whole nation, exclusive of women, children, cripples, and correspondents, is going to spend the winter in France.

A short historical review will give your readers the clearest idea of the elements which compose, and of the spirit which animates, the Prussian or rather German army, as since 1866 the Prussian system has been extended all over Germany, excepting Austria.

Up to 1806, in Prussia, as in all European states, and even yet in the regular army of the United States, the mercenary system of recruiting prevailed. This system totally failed in the battle of Jena, and utterly ruined Prussia. The rusty machine did not work any longer against the French soldiers, who were still fighting with the enthusiasm of the first Revolution. If France was to be beaten, it could only be done by the whole nation; and all its energies had to be tasked, the innermost springs of its

strength to be loosened, in order to succeed against the mighty conqueror. The thinking military men in Prussia—as, for instance, Gneisenau, who had served in America as an Anspach lieutenant, and there gained his experience of the power of a popular army against mercenary troops; Boyen, Clausewitz, Grolman, and, above all, immortal Scharnhorst—co-operated in effecting in their line the same reforms which Stein and Hardenberg were introducing into civil life. While Stein abolished serfdom and the monopolies of the guilds—while he opened free competition in all professions and trades, and empowered the citizens of every town to elect their own local magistrates, and unfolded every grade of intellect on the fundamental principle of Pestalozzi's method, by working the spontaneity of the mind in contradistinction to the cramming of the memory—Scharnhorst reorganized the army, by proclaiming the military service a holy duty instead of a heavy burden, and exempted no citizen, on account of birth, money, or position, from the honor of defending his country.

This spirit pervaded the Prussian armies of 1813, 1814, and 1815, and through this spirit, not through the Russian, Austrian, or English allies, the French yoke was thrown off. Scharnhorst's reforms were made a law on September 19, 1814, and to the present day form the basis of the German system. This law has since undergone some changes; from 1861 to 1866, they assumed the character of a bitter conflict between the King, Bismarck, and Roon, on one side, and the representatives of the people on the other; but the successes in the Austrian and in the present war have made the people bear the new reforms with more good-will. The only material difference between the law as it has been and as it is now is this: According to the old law, a young man of 20 was *theoretically* obliged to three years' service, but *practically* only to one and a half or two years'. After that time he belonged for two years to the reserve, then he was a landwehrman of the first and second ban for seven and five years respectively, so that his military duty expired when he became thirty-eight years old. After having left the regular army, he had to attend the exercises of the landwehr of the first ban two or three times, or spend about twelve weeks more in service, and he had then fully done his duty. The landwehr of the second ban existed only on paper, and has never been called in. But the new reform inaugurated by the present King *really* keeps each soldier three years under arms. As he has to join a regiment at the latest in his twentieth year, he is twenty-three years old when he returns to civil life. To compensate him for the extension of his actual service, he belongs only for four years to the reserve, and for the next five years to the landwehr, the second ban of which has been abolished. Thus, instead of thirty-eight years under the former law, a man is now entirely free from military duty with his thirty-second year. From his twenty-third to his thirty-second year he is called in, once for six weeks as a reservist, and twice for two weeks as a landwehrman, making in all ten weeks in nine years. These peace conditions change, of course, in time of war. Suppose a young man had just served his three years in the army and a war broke out which lasted nine years, he would be obliged to remain with the army for the whole length of the war, viz., four years as a reservist, and five years as a landwehrman.

While the conflict between the executive and legislative powers was raging on this all absorbing topic, the question was ventilated as to the length of time in which a good soldier could be drilled. The King, of course, believed that the entire life of a man was not sufficient, and if he could have had his way he would have kept the whole able-bodied male population in service for their life, leaving all civil and social duties to children, cripples, and women. The radical opposition, like the *Pall Mall Gazette*, thought six months long enough, and with particular predilection quoted the Swiss militia model. There were a great many shades of opposition between these two extremes. Able officers of the general staff of the army, with whom I have often conversed on the subject, agree that a cavalryman or artilleryman requires three years' training for himself and the horses he has to attend to, while an infantryman can be fully drilled in the course of one year, and in two years will be an excellent soldier. The opposition, as a compromise, asked two years for all arms, but the King, ably assisted by Bismarck and Roon, carried his point; and thus three years is now the lawful term of service for every German soldier. Only young men—students, artists, merchants, etc.—who have attained a better education, form an exception to the rule. They can enter as volunteers when they are 17 years old, and serve only one year, but have to support themselves.

How does this system work? The present population of North Germany amounts to about 30,000,000 of inhabitants. Of this population, one per cent., or 300,000 men, form the regular army. As they serve three

years, 100,000 are yearly liable to be levied, and as each man belongs to the army for twelve years, in time of war it can be 1,200,000 strong. At present we have about 1,000,000 of soldiers in the field; the oldest landwehrmen have partly been sent home, about 100,000 are sick or killed, and still others garrison the fortresses. Thus one per cent. of the population does not, of course, represent the whole male population which becomes liable every year, for its number really amounts to from 320,000 to 380,000. But of this number about two thirds are free from service for different reasons, or, in other words, out of three or four men, only one can actually be called in. Among those who are exempt are, above all, cripples, invalids, young men not fully developed or too small—the German standard of measurement is five feet, about five feet one inch or five feet one and a half inches English, while the French measurement is only four feet ten inches; criminals sentenced to state prison; then ministers of the Gospel and teachers, who are obliged to serve only six weeks; the only sons of widows or of aged parents who cannot support themselves; emigrants or people free under state treaties; and, finally, volunteers who serve only one year, on account of their higher standard of education, and are not included in the regular numbers. Taking the sum of recruits at an average of 360,000 per year, and deducting the above two-thirds, there remain 120,000, 20,000 of whom, or sixteen and two-thirds per cent., are not taken, and become exempt by drawing lots. Thus, of a town which has to furnish say 100 recruits per year, those sixteen or seventeen who draw the highest number are not called in. Part of the above are only temporarily exempt, and are placed in the reserve, from which they are called in case of need. In times of peace, the army loses every year an average of 8,000 men by death, accident, or sickness, whose places are filled by those reservists. The agricultural population of North Germany amounts to 72 per cent. of the whole, but in the army it is represented by 80 per cent., as the farmers are generally healthier and more robust. From manufacturing districts, the percentage is smaller, as people working in factories are physically weaker and less developed; but here the difference is partly made up by the wealthier classes, who consider it an honor to serve, and are ambitious of being promoted to officerships in the landwehr. On the whole, it can be said that about 90 per cent. of all able-bodied men are really taken into the service of the army at the age of 20 or sooner, while about ten per cent. are free. You are, therefore, in my opinion, perfectly justified in stating that our army, in time of war, absorbs the best part of the male population, and that it contains men of all professions and pursuits in about the same proportion in which they are found in civil life.

In popular wars, however, like the present, and those of 1813 to 1815, their proportion is much larger than the law prescribes. Ask our venerable friend, Dr. Francis Lieber, how old he was when, as a volunteer in the glorious old Colberg Regiment, he was wounded at Waterloo. It is the same case now. Young students, merchants, artists, noblemen, etc., who are older than seventeen years, do not want to stay at home. They are all eager to fight, and consider each day lost in which they do not face the enemy. The whole of that class of volunteers in the German armies is between 15,000 and 18,000. Of my nephews, for instance, four are in the field. One is a soldier by profession, and, of course, does not belong to this class; another is a farmer and lieutenant in the landwehr, and has been called in; but the two youngsters, one being not quite 19, and the other between 17 and 18, could not be prevented by their mother from joining the army. This is about the proportion in every good family.

Here are a few examples which I can guarantee, as they are within my personal knowledge. From the Berlin University, which has about 2,000 students, 800 have left as volunteers for the field; from the other Berlin high-schools, such as the Polytechnic and Architects' Academy and Academy of Fine Arts, 700 more; thus 1,500 in all. The newly-formed battalions of the Fusiliers of the Guards, 1,000 men strong, which the Berlin people nickname the Maybugs, is exclusively composed of Berlin students. As scholars more widely known, I mention Drs. Hassel (historian), Giercke (jurist), Rothe, and Brakelmann, private lecturers of the Berlin University, the two last of whom have been killed in battle. Brakelmann was studying the archives of Naples for the *Monumenta Germanica*, containing the mediæval sources of German history, when he learned the declaration of war. He hastened home, and, entering the army as a sergeant, sacrificed a glorious future as a scholar to the good cause of his country. Dr. Pabst, another young historian of great promise, was killed in one of the first battles. Of the Breslau University, the whole medical faculty is in the field; all professors and students have joined the army as surgeons, nurses, soldiers, or volunteers. Two students of Königsberg, Hirsch and Müller,

have been decorated with the Iron Cross; a young professor and astronomer, Dr. Tischler, a lieutenant, has been killed in battle.

The other day I introduced my boy to the director of the Frederic William's Gymnasium. On this occasion Dr. Ranke handed me the last year's report of that school. I found in its chronicle, on pages 21 and 23, that in 1814 and 1815 not less than 85 of its pupils entered Paris as victorious Prussian soldiers; that in the present war one of the professors, Dr. Hackstroh, twenty-six years old, was a sergeant in the 46th Infantry Regiment, and fell at Wörth; that another, Dr. E. Richter, an assistant teacher, fell at Metz on August 18; and that of the volunteers who left the Gymnasium at the outbreak of the war, none of them being older than 19 years, 13 were killed, and 8 severely wounded. One of the young men, Max Fleck, was the son of the attorney-general of the army; another, Günther, Count Itzenplitz, son of the present Minister of Commerce; and Count A. von Beust and Count von Schwerin, sons of former ministers of state. Their names will be engraved in gold on a marble tablet in the great hall of the Gymnasium.

On October 20, I saw Shakespeare's "Much Ado about Nothing" at the Royal Theatre. That day's programme, at its foot, states that of the members of this institution the following employees have been called into service, viz.: 3 musicians, 6 singers, 9 dancers, 20 machinists, 4 lamp-lighters, and 6 floor-keepers—48 in all. The Royal Opera has about the same number of its employees in the field.

I cannot give you the name of any prominent statesman or financier, as this class of public men are usually older than our soldiers when they attract public attention; but I know many young diplomatists—Mr. von Krauss, for instance, who, some years ago, was the able secretary of the German Legation at Washington—assistant judges, sons of bankers and merchants, who volunteered at the outbreak of the war, and have partly been wounded or killed on different battlefields. A prominent Cologne banker, Mr. Deichmann, has two sons in the field, one of whom belongs to the firm; the son and junior partner of a Berlin banker, by the name of Königsberger, was pierced by a ball and killed in storming the Spichern heights. A great Berlin publisher of agricultural books, Mr. Percy, owner of the firm of Wigand & Hempel, is a lieutenant of the landwehr now near Paris. More than thirty Prussian judges, who served as privates, sergeants, and lieutenants in the army, have thus far been killed in battle. All these items are so much everyday occurrences that, if there be no personal interest at stake, the individual cases are not even noticed. If I had only a few days' time, I would collect as many hundred illustrations, of all callings in life, and especially in the so-called higher classes, as I have now singly enumerated. But these statements may suffice in answer to the first query; as to the second, I can be more brief, and I will answer its latter part first.

We have not a single loafer in the army, for the sole reason that there are none outside of it. There are criminals in the state prisons, but scoundrels who defy the law, and, as in New York, through political influence, fill even public offices, as police justices, policemen, etc., are an utter impossibility with us. Our country is too poor for indulging in the luxury of loafers. Here a man must work or perish or become a criminal. Besides, we have no political parties which secure them impunity or pardon, and, consequently, no high civil functionaries who call the most brutal cut-throats their good friends. You can afford to entertain nearly an army of that class of the most reckless idlers; here it is just the army which kills loaferism in the bud. The same low and uneducated classes which with you create this cancer of the social body, in this country furnish an excellent stock of efficient sergeants, gendarmes, and lower clerks. These officers are chiefly recruited from those poor but ambitious individuals who, having served at least three years in the army, "capitulate," as the term is, *i. e.*, agree to serve nine years longer, and, as a reward of this twelve years' service, are promoted to one of these small offices. On the other hand, a man upon whom a criminal sentence has been passed is not considered worthy of being a soldier, and consequently is excluded from service.

To conclude with the first part of the second query: society does stand paralyzed just in proportion to the number of men who in time of war are under arms; but the horrors of war, instead of being mitigated, are spread all over the country, and felt in every house, in every family. Deduct one million of men between twenty and thirty-two years—in the present war we have thousands who are older, as they are still liable to service under the old law—from a population of thirty millions, and you will arrive at a conclusion yourself. In the country the loss is less felt than in the cities. There the work of men is partly done by women—invalids assist,

at least, in the performance of the daily duties—and in this war we have more than 300,000 prisoners, who can be compelled to work. In the cities the loss is much harder to bear. From Berlin alone 35,000 young men are in the field, *i. e.*, five per cent. of the whole population of the capital. Some branches are obliged to work with only one-half, others with one-third power, others are shrinking or entirely given up during the war. All trades of luxury are at present at a perfect standstill; booksellers gain little or nothing. All cases pending in the courts against soldiers are suspended, new suits cannot be brought against them, and of the Kammergericht (Court of Appeals), for instance, only five instead of six general and special terms hear and decide cases. The same proportion takes place in other courts. However burdensome this military system may be in some respects, it is at all events the only one which deserves the honor of being called democratic, and the nation which is raised under and by it will always prefer peace to war, and never be dominated by a conquering spirit. For the very reason that it is interwoven with the nation's greatest and smallest interests, the German army will never be more or less than the people in arms, and ask nothing better than to be sent home at the earliest practicable moment, in order to pursue nobler and more productive callings than marching and killing.

FRIEDRICH KAPP.

Correspondence.

"DOES PROTECTION PROTECT?"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your notice of the very admirable work of Mr. W. Grosvenor, "Does Protection Protect?" you say "that the basis of all national prosperity is to be found in the profits earned by the producers of the necessities of life." I cannot fully agree to the form in which you have made this statement, as there are many supposable cases in which prosperity may exist even without great profit, in the sense in which you use that word. For instance, an isolated community, large or small, may enjoy a great abundance of every necessary of life, and yet because of the existence of obstacles to the exchange of their surplus, they may see their surplus product perish on their hands; hence, they may have little or no profit, and but small and slow accumulation of capital. Vermont contained many such communities before the day of railroads. Your reference to profits, however, in connection with the question of protection, leads to a very important view of the matter, which I have never seen presented.

I long since asked myself the question, Why is it that the imposition of duties, and the consequent increase of the cost of imported articles, should cause such persistent controversy, and have so great an effect, when it is the fact that the total import of any nation is very insignificant in amount if compared with the annual domestic product of that nation?

Let us take our own case. The value of the annual product of the United States has been estimated by Mr. Wells at about \$7,000,000,000, and no reasonable objection can be taken to his estimate as a minimum. Our imports, on the other hand, amount to only \$400,000,000 in gold value or \$500,000,000 in currency, bearing the relation of only seven per cent. to the annual product. Upon this import a duty is assessed of about \$180,000,000 in gold, or \$205,000,000 in currency. It would therefore seem that the duty collected is equal to about three per cent. upon the gross product—a heavy tax, but not one to provoke such controversy, if its importance were truly represented by that relation. Its effect, however, is to be estimated by a very different rule. So far as these duties are collected from articles which enter into the processes of our labor, whether as farmers, mechanics, or manufacturers, they enter into the cost of our product; and their effect is to be gauged by their relation to the profit expected from the occupation, and not by their relation to the gross cost of the product.

This can be best understood from one or two examples. Assuming that the amount of duty received by the Government is all that is paid by the consumer, although a considerable addition should be made for cost of collection, interest, and profits, the following would be fair examples:

In a pair of stout boots, worth \$3, the cost of leather constitutes more than one-half the whole cost, say \$1 50. We cannot produce as many domestic hides as we need, and, therefore, the price of all hides is raised to the extent of the duty imposed on those imported. The proportion which the cost of the raw hide bears to the leather is fully one-half. One quarter part of the cost of the boots is, therefore, the cost of hides, and the cost of hides is increased ten per cent. by the duty imposed at that

rate, say, seven-and-a-half cents, or two-and-a-half per cent. on the value of the boots. Apparently a small matter.

But the value of the annual product of a boot factory is not less than four times the capital required to establish the business, and if the tax or duty on the product is two-and-a-half per cent., then it is equal to a tax on the capital of ten per cent. We used to export boots in large quantity to the British Provinces, but as they now have hides free, and therefore have an advantage over us of ten per cent. profit on the capital required to make boots, of course our export has ceased. As Mr. Grosvenor so effectively proves, a high tariff prohibits exports.

Let us take a larger example: We collect annually a little more than \$6,000,000 on about \$15,000,000 worth of drugs, dye-stuffs, chemicals, varnishes, glue, and the like, averaging forty per cent. duty. These articles form an element of the cost of leather, soap, acids, alkalis, furniture, and many other manufactures; yet they themselves cannot be called *raw* material, as they are to a large extent the product of skilled labor and are the result of difficult and costly processes. In general, this class of articles enters into certain manufactures as part of their cost, of which the annual product is very large in proportion to the capital needed to establish them, and therefore the duty upon them is excessive in its relation to the profit on capital. Take furniture, formerly a large article of export. The annual product of a furniture factory is probably five times the capital, and if the heavy duty on varnishes and glue only increases the cost of furniture three per cent., it may be equal to fifteen per cent. on capital—hence we have ceased to export furniture; labor is restricted, and diversity of employment prevented.

But the most striking example is to be found in the use of steel, in the production of which about 3,500 protected workmen are now employed. We are said to excel England in the application of machinery to the making of cutlery, agricultural implements, tools, etc., of which steel is the component material of chief value. I know not what is the relation of capital to annual product in these trades, but I will assume that a plant or capital of \$20,000 will be sufficient to turn out only \$40,000 worth of steel tools, in the cost of which \$15,000 would be the cost of steel and the rest wages. Ten per cent., or \$2,000 a year, profit would induce the establishment of such a machine-shop, if the \$15,000 worth of steel could be had on the same terms on which the cutler or machinist of Sheffield or Birmingham has his supply; but our Government imposes a duty of sixty per cent., or \$9,000, on the steel, equal to four-and-a-half times the exported profit, or over twenty-two per cent. on the capital. Yet, in spite of this, our export of tools has not yet entirely ceased; but what might it not be if exports were not impeded by the tariff; and how soon would that little force of 3,500 protected steel-makers be absorbed in the great army of steel users if the consumption of steel were not obstructed?

A leading member of the English Parliament lately said to me, "We do not fear you as manufacturers, so long as you maintain a high tariff, but when you adopt free-trade you will drive us from many of the markets of the world, for we cannot then compete with you."

It might be impertinent for me to ask if it is not possible that the *Tribune* is subsidized with British gold to maintain a high tariff, and thus obstruct our exports and destroy our commerce.

E. A.

Boston, Nov. 18, 1870.

[We suppose there can be little doubt that the *Tribune* is largely subsidized by somebody, most probably by the British. We know Wells is, for the *Tribune* has repeatedly said so, and after a careful examination of the symptoms in his case, we are driven to the conclusion that Mr. Greeley gets twice Mr. Wells's pay. There is no other way of accounting for the heat he shows in this controversy, for he is not himself a manufacturer. The British are very cunning in their management of these things. They never pay all their gold to one side. They always, when they bribe one man to attack a thing, bribe another to defend it, and then regulate the combat to suit themselves.—Ed. NATION.]

THE FIRST "ALUMNUS" AND MR. PICKERING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: "Timothy Pickering, of Squashville," in the last *New Englander*, attempts to cast ridicule upon all who call for a reform at Yale College, and in his effort greatly misrepresents myself. The length and ability of the article, combined with its home-thrusts, especially the reference to "Bowen's *Independent*," easily identify the writer as a polemical, clerical

member of the Corporation and a former editor of the *Independent*. The *Evening Post* has pointed out his want of fairness in mixing up chips of Mr. Phelps with fragments of the *Nation's* articles, and making both responsible for his own hash. I wish to show how great a mistake he made when he held the first "Alumnus" responsible for the opinions of the second "Alumnus" concerning ministers.

An impartial reader of my article will see that there is not a single word in it inconsistent with that high regard which I expressed for Congregational ministers, some weeks later, in the *Independent*. Indeed, I requested the editor of the *Nation* to announce that I was not the writer of the article of September 1, on the very ground that I was not willing to be responsible for its opinions concerning ministers, and that such opinions had little to do with the point under discussion. And is not this position consistent with my demand that the "government of Yale College shall not rest exclusively with Congregational ministers of the State of Connecticut"? Let Dr. Pickering prove this.

He says: "The first-rate men in any profession are few." Very well; that concedes all that Mr. Phelps or myself demands. Yale College ought to be governed by first-rate men. There are few first-rate men in the ministry, Dr. Pickering tells us. Of course, the number of first-rate men in the Congregational ministry (one of the best, I think) must be proportionately smaller, and yet again proportionately smaller among the Congregational ministers of the State of Connecticut. Now, if "first-rate men" are so scarce, why, instead of selecting them from the professions in the United States, with the able Dr. Pickering to represent the ministry, should they be taken from a single profession, from a single denomination of that profession, in a single small State?

I suppose the reason is that Yale College would grow "as sensational" as Barnum's Museum or Bowen's *Independent* (since the change of editors), if we substituted for the Pickering of Squashville such men as William M. Evarts, Judge Taft, Mr. Sheffield, or Mr. Phelps. But the clergymen will not abdicate. Why? Because he would have us believe the "charter" is in the way. Who doubts that the change can be effected if Squashville is willing?

I believe Dr. Pickering once had a little discussion with the "Nassau Street Tract Society." He was then on the side of reform. But he was told by Daniel Lord that "The constitution, the founders, evangelical Christians, vital godliness," etc., were in the way of their publishing anything against slavery; yet they did so publish when it paid. He has now stolen his former enemy's thunder. His argument is Daniel Lord's with "Yale College" substituted for the Tract Society. President Woolsey proposed a change in the charter and a substitution of six Alumni for the six Senators. Is he also a "fool"? The committee of 1869 favor the same change, and it is well understood that some of them agreed substantially with Mr. Phelps. Were they also "fools"? Moreover, we have reason to believe that a considerable portion of the Faculty, not under the control of the Corporation, would welcome the change. Are they also "fools," as he designates his opponents? Yet, notwithstanding these things, Rev. Mr. Pickering tells us we are "fools" for not allowing the "venerable institution to remain where the founders placed it." Did all wisdom die with the founders? In his view, the "charter" of Yale College is more sacred than the Constitution of the United States, for he favored a change of that.

All he has said about Yale College existing to make Orthodox ministers is the merest rhetoric. As a fact, it does not do that work, except in its theological school. If it did, it would descend from its high national, ecumenical position to be the tool of a single sect. By a parity of reasoning, you could prove that Oxford University ought now to be serving the Catholic Church. Cannot the present Corporation see why Mr. Sheffield, Mr. Peabody, Mr. Street, and Mr. Phelps placed their donations beyond its control? that others withhold funds for the same reason? that either there will be no central, harmonious power to govern the University if this state of things continues, or that the Scientific School must be made to overshadow the Academic Department?

But they declare "they will not abdicate." Well, then, I fear even many Yale men will reluctantly withhold their sons and their funds from the College they so truly love. But we hope for better things.

THE FIRST "ALUMNUS."

MRS. JOSEPHINE BUTLER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I find that your English correspondent, in the last of his letters which I have read, repeats the contemptuous terms of "shrieking and

hysterical declamation" in reference to the efforts which some of the best and most eminent of his countrywomen are making for the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts. It is possible he may not think it worth his while to mention one very remarkable result of these efforts which has just come to pass, and which is likely to have important influence on the fate of these odious enactments. In its last issue, the *Spectator* informs us that "Sir Henry Storks has sustained a severe defeat in Colchester [for which town he was candidate in the Liberal or popular interest for a seat in Parliament], having recorded nearly 600 votes less than his opponent, Mr. Learmouth [the Tory or aristocratic candidate]. The defeat is claimed by the Conservatives, but not quite fairly. In this instance, the Liberal candidate was defeated by Mrs. Josephine Butler. Sir Henry Storks is a warm advocate of the Contagious Diseases Acts, and a letter was produced from him in which he said that the Government must recognize prostitution as a necessity. He probably meant as an inevitability, like sin, or death, or hail; but the sentence ruined him in Colchester, a garrison town, where the act has been put in force. That act will either have to be given up, or discussed in Parliament with open doors."

Now, Sir Henry Storks is no ordinary man. As a military officer and civil administrator he has a high reputation; he did the state good service in Jamaica, or in the Ionian Islands (I am not sure which), as governor; and would most likely have been successful in Colchester, where he had all the Government interest, but for his unlucky dictum, and for the presence and active opposition of Mrs. Butler, who entered on the electioneering campaign in Colchester for the express purpose of preventing his return.

Again, this shrieker and hysterical declaimer, Mrs. Josephine Butler, is no ordinary woman. She is, in every sense, a lady, of noble presence, distinguished manners, and excellent social position. She is a daughter and biographer of John Grey, of Dilston—a Northumbrian gentleman, whose efforts were mainly instrumental in raising his native county to high rank in improved agriculture and social civilization. The Rev. Mr. Butler (Mrs. B.'s husband), an Episcopal clergyman and master of the Liverpool College or High School, is one of a family remarkable for the numbers of eminent educators it has produced, and, I may add, he is in full sympathy with his wife in the self-denying efforts she is making to rid the British statute book of one of its most objectionable and demoralizing enactments.

RICHARD D. WEBB.

DUBLIN, NOV. 8, 1870.

THE CARBON PROCESSES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the notice of the carbon prints in the last *Nation*, there occurs an error, which I beg leave to correct. The process of Braun, of Dornach, is the original autotype process of Swan, the greater brilliancy of the interlineal spaces being due to the superior quality of the negative.

There are three so-called carbon processes, all depending on the quality which the chromates have of rendering gelatine in combination with them insoluble when exposed to light. The autotype process makes the prints by the direct action of sunlight on a chromated gelatine tissue impregnated with coloring matter. The sunlight, penetrating the negative, impresses those portions which represents the shadows, and the print thrown into tepid water permits the lights, which were protected by the dense parts of the negative, to be washed away. The results of this process are in all respects equal to the silver prints, and are indestructible.

The Woodbury-type, or photo-relief, is a mechanical process, in which the gelatine film is, after the action of the light, allowed to lie in cold water, which makes the film swell in those portions corresponding to the lights, producing an intaglio, from which a mould is made, which, being filled evenly with a gelatine ink, is transferred by a press to a paper, on which it dries, preserving all its lines and shades.

In the Albert-type, the block (of ground glass) is coated with a similar film as in the other processes, which, being wetted, swells and gives a printing surface, from which, as from a lithographic stone, many copies can be printed.

I omit, for brevity's sake, details not necessary to the understanding of the principles involved. In the two former processes, the color of the print is some coloring matter mixed with the gelatine; in the last, printer's ink.

Yours truly,

W. J. STILLMAN.

PLAINFIELD, N. J., NOV. 16, 1870.

Notes.

LITERARY.

THE most noticeable original work in Messrs. Appleton's list for November is Dr. Hammond's "Physics and Physiology of Spiritualism." The same house announces "What to Read, and How to Read," by Dr. Charles H. Moore, formerly a professor in two of our Southern colleges. It consists of "classified lists of choice reading, with appropriate hints and remarks, adapted to the general reader, to subscribers to libraries, and to persons intending to form collections of books," and is "brought down to September, 1870." We do not know the compiler's qualifications for his task, but his design is a good one and worthy of the best execution.—We regret to see it announced that the *Riverside Magazine* is not to outlive the year, but, in so far as it partakes of the nature of a family magazine, is to give the benefit of its discontinuance to *Scribner's Monthly*. In form, mechanical excellence, and in its editing, it has seemed to us unsurpassed as a magazine for children; and although we are not convinced that such periodicals are as great an advantage to the young as they are a convenience to parents, while we have them, by all means let us have them at their best. *Our Young Folks* and the *Little Corporal* remain to be taken, one for one reason, and the other for another; and, as American productions, have doubtless something to recommend them above their foreign rivals. Neither of them, however, is in our opinion superior, or equal in pictures or print, to *Good Words for the Young*, conducted by George MacDonald, of which Messrs. J. B. Lippincott & Co. are the agents in this country.—Messrs. Hurd & Houghton announce volumes two and three, completing Prof. G. W. Greene's "Life of Nathaniel Greene," a substantial contribution to our Revolutionary history.—Messrs. Dodd & Mead will issue "Marcella of Rome," by Frances Eastwood, a story that has already appeared in *Hours at Home*; also, a new story, of which the title is not yet divulged, by the fertile author of the "Schönberg-Cotta Family."—Messrs. W. C. Little & Co., Albany, will publish for Mr. Audley W. Gazam—whose "Treatise on Bankruptcy" is shortly to go into a second edition—another work, "Bankruptcy Digest and Rules of Practice," which will doubtless also prove serviceable to the profession.—One of the consequences of the cessation of *Putnam's Magazine* was the cutting short of Mrs. Mary Clemmer Ames's serial story, "Eirene"—owing to her inability to finish it in season—but the whole may shortly be expected in book-form. Messrs. Putnam & Sons announce also a "Popular Standard Speaker and Guide to Oratory."

—It cannot be long before communication by cable-telegraph will make the affairs of Brazil of daily interest to us, and quicken the interchange of merchandise and ideas between the two countries, which already is not slight. In developing the fringe of that wilderness of an empire, American skill, it is well known, has been freely employed, and with the most gratifying results, while American manufactures find there an ever-increasing sale in spite of European competition. The Emperor's partiality for our language and literature has been frequently attested, and our savants who have visited his provinces in the interest of science have been treated by him with the most enlightened hospitality. It may readily be supposed that his subjects will improve any reasonable opportunity to extend their acquaintance with the people of the United States; and as the best way to do this is to study our mother-tongue, they will be glad of the English Reader just prepared for them by Mr. J. C. Rodrigues, editor of *O Novo Mundo*, of which we spoke lately. Messrs. A. S. Barnes & Co. are the publishers of "Chrestomathia de Lingua Inglesa," a book of some 400 pages duodecimo. The compiler prefixes a general view of the origin of language, then treats of the Indo-European group, and of the derivation from it, composition, and development of the English language, in the usual manner, with a brief survey of each period to the present time. This introduction is followed by extracts in prose and verse, generally copied from similar compendiums, and prefaced in each case by a short account of the writer. The defects observable in this part of the editing—and they are not many nor serious—indicate original labor on the part of Mr. Rodrigues, and it is creditable to him that, in aiming apparently to select such pieces as would tend to elevate his countrymen, he has given rather more than their share of space to the writers of the present century. In regard to the literature of the United States, he is of opinion that it is far less original, as compared with that of England, than that of Brazil is as compared with the Portuguese.

—Since we were so indiscreet, in noticing the magazines for Novem-

ber, as to allude to the charges brought against Mr. Seward by Ex-Secretary Welles, it is but fair to say that General M. C. Meigs has taken some exceptions, in a Washington paper, to the correctness of the *Galaxy* article, which no one can fairly pronounce upon the quarrel without considering. He says that Mr. Welles attributes to him a statement which he used in a former rectification of the history of Fort Sumter merely to controvert it, and that this made a very important and indeed essential link in Mr. Welles's chain of evidence. We cannot here go over the whole story, but the point is as to whether the *Powhatan* was detached from the Sumter expedition by influence brought to bear, either patriotically or not, upon President Lincoln. General Meigs alleges that this vessel was assigned, at his instance, to the relief of Fort Pickens two days after the Sumter fleet was made up without her, he being ignorant of the latter expedition and Secretary Welles being kept ignorant of the former. Of course, when the Secretary wished to add the *Powhatan* to his fleet, she was engaged, and he was naturally chagrined. However, General Meigs says she could not have rendered the least service at Sumter, as events proved.

—Mr. Disraeli has improved the occasion of a new edition of his collected works to write a preface in which he reviews them all, explaining the motives with which each one of them was written, and so saving some trouble to his future biographer. He consoles himself as against his critics, whom he speaks of with his usual contempt, with the fact that "Lothair" has received a vast deal of attention from the American press, and that even in England "the aggregate of articles" which it has evoked "is in amount perhaps unprecedented." And he is obliging enough to say that the American notices appear to him "generally to be sincere," and that he thinks they need not fear competition with the similar productions of his own country "in point of literary ability, taste, style, and critical acumen." Another satisfaction he derives from retrospect is that "Goethe and Beckford were impelled to communicate their unsolicited opinions of 'Contarini Fleming' to its anonymous author," and that Heine wrote a criticism on it "of which any author may be justly proud." And we cannot suppose him to be wholly unflattered by the popularity of "Vivian Grey," which he calls an essentially puerile work, but which "has baffled even the efforts of its creator to suppress it," so that "forty-four years after its publication he must ask the indulgence of the reader for its continued and inevitable reappearance." Other parts of this preface are a sort of political testament of the author, and do not need to be dwelt upon here.

—Announcements of English publications for the season are not yet over. The titles that follow probably represent by this time works already issued, if they have not indeed reached this country: "The Prophetic Spirit in its Relation to Wisdom and Madness," by Rev. A. Clissold, might perhaps be profitably read in connection with Dr. Hammond's forthcoming work on Spiritualism; "The Companions of St. Paul" is by J. S. Howson, D.D., Dean of Chester, who also treats in a companion volume of "The Character of St. Paul;" "The Miracles of Our Lord," by George MacDonald, "Half-Hours in the Temple Church," by the Master of the Temple, Rev. C. J. Vaughan, and "Essays, Theological and Literary," by Mr. R. H. Hutton, are also works in which clergymen will be interested. These occupy a middle ground between history (including biography) and theology, viz.: "Walks in Rome," by Augustus J. C. Hare; "The History and Literature of the Israelites, according to the Old Testament and the Apocrypha," by C. and A. D. de Rothschild, in two volumes, of which the first treats of the historical books, the second of the prophetic and poetical; a third edition of Mr. J. F. Maguire's "Rome and its Ruler," which has been "brought down to the latest moment," and appropriately re-entitled "The Pontificate of Pius the Ninth;" "The Life and Letters of Hugh Miller," by Peter Bayne; "Memorials of R. D. Hampden, sometime Bishop of Hereford," edited by his daughter, Henrietta Hampden; and possibly these two will be mentioned in place: "Iona," by the Duke of Argyll, and Mr. J. C. Jeaffreson's "Annals of Oxford." Contributions to science are: "The Natural History of the Azores," by F. Du Cane Godman, and "The Ornithology of Shakespeare," by J. E. Harting, who is not to be behind those who have explored the grammar, religion, law, and other knowledge of the dramatist. "A Book of Almanacks for any Day preceding A.D. 2000," by Prof. De Morgan, is evidently good for the use of the youngest inhabitant of this planet, and the correctness of any part of it is not likely to be called in question by any one who trusts in it. Those given to looking backward rather than to forecasting may prefer the novel "In Memoriam Album" (London: Simpkin & Co.). Memorial cards, for the preservation of which this album has been devised, are scarcely known in this country, except as received from friends abroad; and it is left to some publisher here to prepare a record in which deaths may be entered.

whatever the source of information concerning them. Such a list, kept during an average lifetime, would be useful also afterwards if deposited in a public library.

—“America,” in the rubrics of Continental newspapers, as often as not refers to South America, but in the following titles it signifies the United States: “Sketches from America,” by John White, who divides his book into three parts—(1) Canada, (2) Apie to the Rocky Mountains, (3) The Irish in America; and “Eleven Years’ Experience in the Western States of America,” by W. M. Stewart, who adds to his narrative an analysis of prairie soil. Other books of travel are: “The Land of the Sun,” by Lieut. C. R. Low, who gives memoranda, historical and geographical, of places of interest in the East which he visited during many years’ service in Indian waters; and “Peeps at the Far East,” or a familiar account of India, by Norman Macleod, D.D. Moxon’s edition of “Wordsworth’s Complete Works,” with a critical memoir by Mr. W. M. Rossetti, is out; and we are to have “Ballads of Life,” by Robert Bachanan; “Rehearsals, a Book of Verses,” by John Leicester Warren; “Poems of Bygone Years,” edited by Elizabeth M. Sewell; and “The Songstresses of Scotland,” in two volumes, by Misses Tytler and Watson. Miss Tytler also offers a second series of her “Papers for Thoughtful Girls;” and thoughtful children, without regard to sex, will be edified by “Chamber Dramas for Children,” by Mrs. George MacDonald; “At the Back of the North Wind,” and “Ralph Bannerman’s Boyhood,” by her husband; and “The Boy in Grey,” by Henry Kingsley, assisted by the pencil of Mr. Arthur Hughes.

—The English quarterlies have not yet given up entirely a certain practice of theirs, which now for many years has made them ridiculous in the eyes of the American reader, and, moreover, has kept the American reader in a state of extreme exasperation. The editor would appear to think that, in the case of European, Asiatic, African, and Australasian topics, he must get hold of writers to treat of them who thoroughly understand their subject, or, at least, he must try and get hold of writers who have a good deal of knowledge of their subject. If, then, for example, affairs of Bokhara are of current interest at a given moment, the editor of the *Edinburgh* or the *Westminster* bestirs himself to get hold of some traveller or diplomatic agent or army officer who really has seen, and seriously considered, the Russian advance through Central Asia towards India. If the Kabyles call for discussion, the editor seeks for some man who knows Algiers, either from observation or from much reading, or from both. Mr. Gladstone, if possible, is to be had in to write about Continental politics when Continental politics are of interest to the British public. Mr. Lowe or Mr. Childers the editor might, it is probable, supplicate for a paper on colonial questions should the former home of these ministers furnish subject-matter for a couple of editorial articles in the *Times*. Medes, Ethiopians, Jews, the sledged Polack, Fenians and Esquimaux, Mesopotamians and dwellers in the isles of the sea—all secure from the Quarterly editor the best ability that he has at command. But if there is about the office a young lion, whose teeth are not as yet grown, and who yet, for a season, must mumble the prey till he be of such strength as to rend it—if there is on the list of contributors a Scotchman learning to write English, and capable of endless quantities of padding, which shall at least have the true dogmatic Quarterly ring—or if there is a promising young man at the University who knows some things, and knows, further, that he is omniscient, and likes to be slashing in a review—such a scholar and critic is the person whom the Quarterly editor sets at work to review “American literature,” or to explain, in 1870, that the true character of the American polity may be best perceived in the greedy violence with which that people has wrested from “a sister republic” the province of Texas; or to point out that in the city of New York republicanism has been carried to its logical outcome—with what result is known to Messrs. Overend, Gurney, McHenry, Sir Morton Peto, and other victims of the rascality of Fisk, Gould, Tweed, and other acknowledged Democratic leaders. The *North British Review*, for example, published a while ago—some three years since, perhaps—an article on American literature which probably is to-day an article *de fide* with some thousands of Englishmen and Scotchmen. Its author was Mr. Gerald Massey, a student of literature who has the same claim to attention as a literary authority which Captain Isaiah Rynders would have in a school of oratory—both gentlemen having in common the power of misusing articulate speech, to the present pleasure and lasting injury of themselves and numbers of other people. Few American authors had places in “Chambers’s Cyclopædia of English Literature;” but “Maria del Occidente” and Mrs. Lydia Sigourney had produced some verses which Mrs. Hemans might have been not ashamed to own; Edgar Allan Poe, a man of irregular life, had written some weird poems; and the cele-

brated American sense of humor had exhibited itself in calling the bed-bug “the essence pedlar”—that, we believe, was the substance of Mr. Massey’s account of us; for his remarks about Washington Irving and the novels of Mr. Cooper were not distinctively his own, nor very fresh.

—The current *Westminster* has a similar essay, telling us of Charles Brockden Brown, for instance, and the “eloquent but diffusive” William Wirt And we “have no national literature,” yet we have various tribes of the “red or copper-colored race,” as the geographers say; and why, under those circumstances, we are not fitted out with a literature truly American there are no reasons, the writer seems to think, except that we are all engaged in the eager pursuit of wealth, and—this being the more civil and tender reason—that we are at present necessarily engaged in “subduing the continent,” which our English ancestors won for us from the French. Jonathan Edwards, indeed, we have produced—a metaphysician admitted to be worthy of praise, even among European metaphysicians. Emerson, however, sits under the tree that Fichte planted, and means little. Longfellow also is Teutonic, though in another way than Emerson. Still Longfellow’s “Psalm of Life” is great; and his “Hiawatha,” if only we had followed its lead, would have led us to a true nationalism in literature. Nathaniel Hawthorne has few Americanisms, and writes so as to offend no English taste. In essay writing we do very well—as well as anybody; but a long poem we cannot produce; and, indeed, we are so well persuaded that we cannot produce a great poem that we have been at pains to frame a theory in relation to the matter, and declare that a poem is of necessity short, and that all long poems are, in fact, several short poems connected together by strips of prose—“Homer sometimes nods,” in fact, is what we maintain. Thus our author goes on talking seriously of books and writers of whom, in the Pre-Adamite times, and the days of the *Democratic Review* and the *Analectic*, we also, who live here in America, used to talk seriously; talking condescendingly of writers whom no one who has the right to employ condescension would think of patronizing; and altogether making a jumble of old nonsense and new nonsense, and trite truth and trite foolishness, which might discourage a millenarian optimist. How the United Kingdom is ever to be Americanized if essays like these are to be written and read in good faith, it is sometimes hard to see.

—The same number of the *Westminster* which contains the typical British essay on American literature—a literature in which, after all, meanly as most of us are disposed to think of ourselves, we have “The Federalist” in political philosophy; the speeches of Webster against Hayne, in oratory and politico-legal reasoning; the works of Story, Marshall, Kent, and Wheaton, in law; the romances of Hawthorne in prose fiction; the satire and wit of “The Biglow Papers,” and the admirable products of the imagination as exercised in the creation of characters at once typical and individual; the profound criticism, so acutely apprehensive and comprehensive, of Emerson; the kindly universality of sentiment which makes Longfellow the chosen, well-chosen, favorite poet of a greater number of people than listen to any other English-speaking poet; the careful scholarship of Whitney, Child, Palfrey, Sophocles, Wyman, Noyes, Parkman, Lea, Morgan, and Agassiz—the same number of the *Westminster* which contains the essay with which we have been finding fault contains also an essay which, we are bound to say, is of such a character as to be of use to any one who should feel disposed to charge us with having done injustice to editors of English quarterlies, in saying of them what we have been moved to say above. One of the essays in the last *Westminster* shows quite sufficient knowledge of American affairs. It tells the story of the famous “corner” in the Wall Street Gold Market, which was effected by Mr. Jay Gould and Mr. James Fisk, jun., in September last. It is no more than fair to say that one might look far in our native newspapers and magazines before coming on any writer who has brought more local knowledge to the handling of this particular American topic. The judges of the New York Supreme Court, or the attorneys of the Erie Railway Company, could hardly themselves evince a more thorough familiarity with New York judicial and financial circles. We bespeak for it the attention of all advisers, friends, and enemies of Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Fisk, Mr. Tweed, and the Boston, Hartford, and Erie Railroad Company. To one aspect of American life—it will be confessed even by the editors of Boston newspapers, or by Mr. Wendell Phillips and Mr. S. P. Cummings—our English brethren have at last done something like justice.

—The question of the Pope’s infallibility illustrates better than any other question which this generation is likely to hear discussed the rule that every doctor, from the doctor of divinity down to the horse doctor, habitually and regularly disagrees with every other doctor—possibly as

the safest way of assuring himself and others of his having any right to the title. So far as we have heard, no two persons—outside of persons possessed of that "faith" which removes the mountain by shutting the eyes and asserting that there isn't any mountain—have come to anything like a practical agreement as to the significance of the latest of Roman dogmas. Dr. Ward, of the *Dublin Review*, could probably put his finger on several gentlemen under the personal charge of Cardinal Cullen, or that of Archbishop Manning, who would agree with him that, in case the Pope should casually assert of his new shoes that they were completely worn out, there would be small hopes of salvation for any Christian who, on inspection of them, should hold that the shoes were in good order, or that his Holiness had in that instance not spoken infallibly. Incredible as it seems, it is yet beyond doubt that there are people who are ready to go quite as far as we have imagined Dr. Ward going. What, indeed, can be incredible as regards the beliefs of a certain party among Roman Catholics when one hears it said of a very high dignitary of the church—an Englishman, too, and educated at Oxford—that, attempting to confute such bishops as opposed the promulgation of the new dogma on the ground that the time was inopportune, his way of convincing them was to look up the word "opportunity" in the New Testament, and point out to his opponents that it occurred but four times, and that in the most important of the four passages it relates to the action taken by Judas, when (Matthew xxvi. 16) he "from that time sought 'opportunity' to betray him"? But among the Roman Catholics whom Protestants, thinking of Mr. Ward and Archbishop Manning, would describe as comparatively sensible and reasonable, there would appear to be hardly two men holding the same opinion as to the scope and meaning of the dogma just enunciated by the Vatican council—if, indeed, there has been an enunciation so technically correct as to make a dogma binding. What is it, for example, for a pope to speak "*ex cathedra*"? What questions are questions of morals, in the sense of being such "questions of faith and morals" as the Pope, speaking *ex cathedra*, can pronounce upon? M. Gambetta, for instance, is a Catholic, let us suppose; could he expect from Pope Pius IX. an indubitably correct answer to an enquiry as to whether the present government of France is morally commendable in declining to make a peace? If a future pope revives and approves a doctrine which a former pope has denounced as heretical, is it true, as Archbishop Purcell would say, that the mere fact of such revival makes of the pope who effects it a heretic—a pope whom God there and then deposes? What, then, becomes of the bishops and priests who, believing the pope infallible, as they are bound to believe him, give internal assent to the heretical doctrine promulgated by the fallible corpse of a pope? Does God, there and then, at the time of their internal acquiescence, depose them also, and make of them heretics and laymen, instead of consecrated priests? But if there are no assenting priests, what becomes of the infallibility of the Pope? and does not the capacity of the priests to sit in judgment on a pope argue infallibility in them?

— These and a thousand other difficulties are naturally suggested by the utterances which, during the last six months, have been made by Roman Catholic teachers in all parts of the world. A common consent they seem to have in respect of but one thing—none of them has as yet done anything to call down on himself excommunication. How (without explaining it away) to explain this new dogma, and at the same time keep himself a Catholic whom the head of the church would not think devoted to eternal misery, no one not an Ultramontanist seems in the least to know. Whether the Pope himself would satisfy a thorough-going Ultramontanist his last public performance leaves doubtful. He, the other day, addressed to the Cardinals a circular letter, in which, protesting against certain acts of the Italian authorities now governing Rome, he would seem to say that King Victor Emmanuel's aldermen and policemen have succeeded in shearing away from him much, or all, of his power to govern the church as her infallible teacher ought to govern her. "Any one who possesses good sense," says the circular of which we speak, "will see and confess that, having no longer supreme power in the use of public means of conveyance, or in the public circulation of letters, we are really deprived of the necessary and speedy way of treating the affairs which the vicar of Jesus Christ must treat and administer." And again: "We find ourselves now wanting in that freedom which is absolutely indispensable to us, in order to govern the church of God." At first sight, this certainly looks like an infallibly true assertion, that the government of the church is no longer within the power of the Pope; and, as may be imagined, numbers of the Episcopalian enemies of the Babylonian harlot are rejoicing over what they assert to be the official announcement of the *déchéance* of the Pa-

pacy—which, however, as they may probably discover, has a way of surviving suicide that says much for its vitality, or want of it.

— To what the Pope is referring when, in the circular above-cited, he speaks of the free use of "public means of conveyance," we do not know. As regards his power over the "public circulation of letters," the *Church Times*, London, volunteers some evidence which could no doubt get confirmation. "Just before the assembly of the Pan-Roman Council," says the editor of the *Times*, "an English gentleman, long resident in Italy, and of the highest literary reputation, made an offer to us through a common friend to supply us with letters on the subject. We immediately wrote out to the gentleman's address in Rome, but our letter, instead of being delivered, was returned to us about four months afterwards. In the meantime, our correspondent wrote expressing his surprise at receiving no answer, but his letter was likewise suppressed." Considering the nature of the documents proceeding from the Vatican, the Papal court is wiser in its generation, most people would think, to trust to the suppression of other people's letters than the circulation of its own. However that may be, the Romans are probably a sufficiently irreligious community—not to say a sufficiently blasphemous and ungrateful congeries of vermin—to be pleased with the recent change in the postal regulations of their city.

BRENTANO'S HISTORY OF GILDS.*

It is not until within a few years that the historical importance of the guilds of the Middle Ages has been recognized, and even now there are few who are aware how great this importance was and how extensive their influence, even outside of their municipalities. Dr. Brentano's treatise is, as the publishers say, "the first and only one in English reviewing the whole subject of *Gilds*;" and it deserves to be carefully studied, as well by those who wish to understand the development of mediæval society as by those who are interested in the present phase of the labor question, which is nearly connected with that of earlier times. It is hard to say, therefore, whether this book is more valuable as a contribution to history or to social science. In its treatment, however, it is rather historical than practical, and it is the historical aspect from which we propose to regard it.

Besides the trades-unions of the nineteenth century, three classes of guilds are treated of in this essay—religious or social guilds, guild-merchants, and craft-guilds—and each of these four institutions illustrates a distinct and important historical fact. The first class, of the religious guilds, was the earliest and most general in its nature—so general, indeed, that the term *religious* has been objected to, and *social* proposed. Our author defends the title in common use, on the ground that all, whatever their object, had a certain religious character, and grouped themselves about certain religious observances. For the matter of that, these features were common also to other guilds. The objects of those under consideration were as various as possible—some for charity, some purely social, some for special religious observances (as burning candles on the altar of the Virgin, maintaining sacred processions, or performing religious plays), some even for political objects. In fact, these early guilds seem to have exactly represented our modern clubs or societies, possessing just that degree of religious formality which everything had in those times, and marked also by a closer union among the members than is the case nowadays. Each had some saint as its patron, all had banquets at stated seasons, and all demanded and fostered a closer feeling of brotherhood in their members, with mutual aid and defence.

In regard to the origin of these institutions, Dr. Brentano agrees with Thierry that they were derived from the pagan sacrificial banquets of the northern nations, rather than with Wilda and Hartwig, who would give them a Christian origin. The guilds, he thinks, were organized on the type of the family, and were calculated to satisfy certain needs for which in an earlier state of society the family union had provided. In primitive times, "the family was a community of all-comprehending importance, and its care provided completely for nearly all the wants of the individual," especially in whatever concerned "the relations of private law—the legal protection of life, limb, and property." But in time "the natural bond of the family become more and more relaxed with the increase of the number of relatives, and with the rise of special interests among the individual members," and there was, moreover, a "constantly increasing number of kinless people and of strangers." The family was

* "On the History and Development of Gilds, and the Origin of Trade-unions. By Lujo Brentano, of Aschaffenburg, Bavaria, Doctor Juris Utriusque et Philosophiæ." London: Trübner & Co., 60 Paternoster Row, E. C. 1870. 8vo, pp. 135.

now, of course, inadequate to the new demands of society, while no public authority was yet in a condition to assume the protection of individuals; the guilds, then, modelled on the family and preserving much of its character, with a looser and wider organization, formed a convenient transition between the earlier order of things and the fully developed state.

Perhaps the most interesting class of guilds is that of town-guilds or guild-merchants—frith-guilds the author often calls them, without anywhere explaining the term. These were associations of all the full citizens of a town, for the sake of self-defence and other objects of general interest; in such cases "the citizens and the gild became identical, and what was gild-law became the law of the town." But this identity was only temporary; "the quality of being a full citizen did not of itself include the fellowship of the sworn-gild; for this a special acceptance was required"—just as in the case of the "commoners" of New England towns, to which we alluded a few weeks ago. Consequently, in time the original guild became closed, and the families which belonged to it were developed into a patriciate, known as the *summum concivium*, which continued to govern after it had ceased to be identical with the city. Then other inferior guilds sprang up by its side. In this way many of the town constitutions of Northern Europe began in guilds, as described by Augustin Thierry in his "Considérations sur l'Histoire de France." In some towns the guild thus developed was only one of two or three municipal organizations, and our author hardly makes distinct enough the relation in such cases of this community to the other communities in the same town. Thus, in Note 3 (p. xi.), he speaks of the two communities which existed together in Worms in the eleventh century—that of the Bishop's Manor and that of the Old Freemen (in earlier times there had been two others, that belonging to the royal palace and that to the demesnes, *Stamm-gut*, the *Salians*, both of which were united under the rule of the bishop). From the Old Freemen were descended the patrician families of later time, while the bishop's vassals in the main became craftsmen. So in Ratisbon, the great emporium of the eastern trade, there were distinguished the king's city, the priests' city, and the merchants' city. These communities in a community resembled somewhat the Roman *plebs*, which formed a distinct, self-governing body subordinate to the patrician state. It would seem, then, that the town-guilds in such cases must have been confined to the city of the freemen or merchants, while in new towns the guilds comprised all the citizens. These town-guilds, as has been already intimated, consisted chiefly of merchants, and in many towns the terms merchant and burgher are synonymous; in Paris, for instance, the *mercatores aquæ* formed the municipal body, which probably explains the fact that in the seditions during King John's captivity, the government of Paris was in the hands of Etienne Marcel, provost of the merchants. These guilds it was that carried through the great movement of the enfranchisement of the communes and establishment of free cities in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and that founded the powerful leagues of the thirteenth century.

It has been already said that the town-guilds became, in time close oligarchies. At first, free handicraftsmen were admitted as members, but afterwards these were excluded, and the government of the cities fell entirely into the hands of the patrician families of old citizens. These, of course, did as such oligarchies always do—securing to themselves the privileges and emoluments, and throwing the burdens upon the lower classes. This led to the organization of craft-guilds, which carried on against the old guilds a struggle similar to that which these had carried on against the nobles, and with the same result. This struggle marks the fourteenth century, as the earlier one did the twelfth. Thus, in the old Roman city of Cologne, the power was, in the twelfth century, in the hands of the guild of Old Freemen or *rich*—the *Reicherzcheit*. Then came a violent contest of two hundred years, the craftsmen striving to get a share of the government, and sometimes uniting for this purpose with the archbishop, whose aim was to rule over both. At one time, a coalition between these two overturned the rule of the patricians; but when the designs of the archbishop were understood, the "families" were recalled and reinstated in their privileges. This contest was ended in 1396 by a revolution which gave the craft-guilds a share, and even the predominance, in the government. Under the previous order of things "the craftsmen were," says Dr. Brentano, "almost the serfs of the patricians" in this city, while the patricians themselves, by their misgovernment, turbulence, and feuds (between the *Overstolzen* and *Weissen*) had quite wiped out the memory of their good work in a former time.

The crafts were now on an equality with the families, but their

degeneracy was as rapid and as marked as that of the families had been. A kind of aristocracy of office holders developed itself among them, and they soon became close and illiberal in their policy. "In the place of an oligarchy of landed proprietors, an oligarchy of capitalists stepped in." It was at this time that those selfish regulations with regard to admission to the trades were established, almost the same as some of the present demands of the trades unions, which we are wont to associate especially with the Middle Ages, while in fact they characterize only its closing century. "In the fourteenth century commenced the transformation of the trades into entails of a limited number of families." It is important to note that at this time there was no marked division between employers and employed. The craft-guilds represented and embodied the whole trade, controlled, in fact, by the masters rather than the men, but masters who had themselves worked as apprentices and journeymen, and whose workmen expected themselves soon to be masters.

This consideration leads to the origin of Dr. Brentano's fourth class, the trades unions, which he has treated with great fulness and interest. He does not consider these to have been derived from the guilds, as has been held, but rather as their legitimate representatives in the changed order of things, coming into existence, as they did, to meet an immediate want. As the craft-guilds sprang up in the Middle Ages to maintain the independence of industry against a landed aristocracy, so these have sprung up in the nineteenth century to defend labor against capital. The special cause of this new movement is found in the changed conditions of manufactories, resulting from the introduction of machinery. The necessary consequence of machinery was that the manufactures were concentrated in large factories, owned by large capitalists; naturally, there soon appeared an antagonism of interest between the capitalists and the laborers, and this led to the formation of trades unions. Our limits will not allow us to enter into the detailed consideration of these. Their historical relations are sufficiently illustrated by what has been said, and the abuses which called them into being are described by Dr. Brentano with great vigor. The violence and unreasonableness of many of their actions and demands at the present day need not blind us to the good they have actually accomplished and may yet accomplish, if they will only leave politics and go to helping themselves—if, too, they will learn to distinguish what is just and practicable from mischievous chimeras.

HOLIDAY BOOKS FOR THE YOUNG.*

IN renewing our annual survey of juvenile literature, mention shall first be made of the designs of Miss Chase, daughter of the Chief-Justice, illustrating some of Mother Goose's rhymes, and some not commonly found in nursery collections, with two or three from the French and German. The original drawings, numbering fifteen in all, besides initial letters, were in water-color, and have been fairly imitated by chromolithography. They will be sure to find favor with any child to whom they are shown, and deservedly so, as they are fresh and pretty conceptions, drawn with great freedom and tastefully colored, and exhibit a nice sense of humor in the artist. The figures are always spirited, if not all so correct as that of "Tom, Tom, the Piper's Son," which begins the series, but the perspective of which leaves something to be desired. The sad fate of the little old woman who had her petticoat shortened by the mischievous pedlar, is very well shown in the picture and initial letters; and the designs for "Old Tuskummik, Medicine Man," and "Chan-wan, the Good Old Man," with its companion-piece about "Ping-wing, the Pie-man's Son," who

"—threw the cat in the boiling rice,
And when they'd eaten her, said he,
'Me wonders where the mew-cat be,'"

are highly amusing. We can but think it a decided gain for our young folks that Miss Chase was persuaded to share her portfolio with the public.

"Holiday Pleasures" has all the appearance of having been written to suit Mr. Geissler's etchings, which are very well worth a fitting text. The "introduction" has no connection with what follows, which tells of the year's doings—month by month—of the little school-boy who is supposed to appear in every one of the twelve full-page pictures. There is no point

* "Mother Goose's Melodies." Philadelphia: Porter & Coates. 1870.

"Holiday Pleasures. With an Introduction, by the Author of 'Harry Lawton's Adventures.' With Twelve Etchings by Rudolph Geissler." New York: Putt & Amery. 1870.

"Daisy's Companions; or, Scenes from Child Life. A Story for Little Girls. By the Author of 'Grandmamma's Nest.'" Boston: Roberts Bros. 1871.

"The Brownies, and Other Tales. By Juliana Horatia Ewing. With Illustrations by George Cruikshank." Boston: Roberts Bros. 1871.

"Labor Stands on Golden Feet. A Holiday Story. By Heinrich Zschokke. Translated by John Yeats, LL.D." New York: Dodd & Mead.

to these narratives, which, however, are pleasantly told and in language carefully chosen for the age which it addresses. Mr. Geissler's children are of the same German type as Oscar Pletsch's, and drawn with as firm and sympathetic a hand, and his compositions, though they may not particularly interest the young, will improve their taste. Viewed merely as etchings, they are rather dull and monotonous, but we shall probably meet with few illustrations this season which will equal them in general excellence.

"Daisy's Companions" belongs to a class of children's books that seems to keep in favor with the public, if we may judge from the reinforcements it receives on each return of the holidays; a class which we are inclined on the whole to think does a good work in spite of its over-refinement, the precocious virtue of its hero or heroine, and, above all, the romantic imagination it fosters and stimulates. But where the heroine is, like Daisy, not painfully pious, but really good—a genuine lump of sugar to take the lessons of generosity and amiability on—she may be welcomed into a household. And where the good-breeding is so thorough—alas! in how much of our juvenile literature it is lacking!—American mothers may not mind the frequent allusions to little girls' "maids," and other luxuries of an English household. The high flavor of romance is the most dubious quality of the book, but just there, of course, lies its success with the children.

"The Brownies" is another book typical of a class which has an adult audience in its eye, and not a childish one. Parents will certainly be much entertained by this clever effort, and may be able to translate "The Land of Lost Toys" and "Amelia and the Dwarfs" to their children, in a way to give amusement; but we are very much afraid that the little ignoramus will never be able to master for themselves a style of which these are specimen sentences:

"A gutta-percha cherub in a chronic state of longitudinal squeeze.

"Not being a metaphysician, he did not understand that it is safer to found opinions on principles than on experience, since experience may alter, but principles cannot.

"Boys will be boys; but there is a limit to the forbearance implied in the extenuating axiom."

But if the language is not, like Truthful James's, "plain," the ideas are very lively and ingenious, as for example the following. An old maiden lady, still fond of toys, dreams that she is in a province of Fairyland, to which all toys, and all things ever used by children as toys, eventually find their way. Their rank here is according to the value that had been set upon them, so that an old potato, the sole plaything of an Irish baby in a tenement-house, is in a high place, while the costly toys of the rich occupy back seats. The abused toys had resolved to avenge themselves on the first human being that should chance to find his way to their abode. The old lady finds herself surrounded by the victims of her carelessness and is comically threatened:

"Tie a string round her neck, and take her out bathing in brooks," said an old doll. "Tear her wig off! Scrub the paint off her face! Flatten her nose on the pavement! Saw her legs off and give her no crinoline! Take her out bathing, I say, and bring her home on a wheelbarrow, with fern-roots on the top of her."

"Take her to pieces to see what she's made of!" said a German toy.

"Dip her in water, and leave her to soak on a soup-plate," said a paint-box."

She is finally put to bed in the doll's bedstead, and immediately breaks through on touching it.

A book for older children than any of the foregoing, and indeed composed for adults who are children from lack of education and from their condition in life, is "Labor Stands on Golden Feet." The maxims in which it abounds, and its examples of honest industry making a way to competence and public esteem, are likely to do good to thoughtful boys as well as to the laboring classes, and the former will find the story interesting enough to make them wish to read it through. Much of the purpose with which it was written depends upon a state of society which does not exist in this country; but for the formation of personal character, no part of the narrative is superfluous. The plot is extremely simple; there are two wooings, not difficult to foresee in either case; and the star of the travelling tinker continues lucky to the end. The author makes an effort to reconcile the institution of guilds with the progress of the age in the application of science to the arts. This discussion will probably be skipped by his young readers, and without much loss; but it would be well if some one would tell them, in an attractive way, what there was sound and true in the old system that might survive it to advantage.

* * Publishers will confer a favor by always marking the price of their books upon the wrapper.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.

Publishers.—Prices.

Bulwer (Sir H. L.), Life of Palmerston, 2 vols.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	
Bundy (J. M.), Are We a Nation? swd.	(G. P. Putnam & Sons)	
Colange (L.), Zell's Popular Encyclopedia, No. 48, swd.	(T. Ellwood Zell)	\$0 50
Complete Triumph of Moral Good over Evil.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	
Crane (Rev. J. T.), Arts of Intoxication.	(Carlton & Lanahan)	
Friswell (J. H.), The Gentle Life.	(Sampson Low & Co.)	
Holiday Pleasures: illustrated Child's Book.	(Pott & Amery)	
Huxley (Prof. T. H.), Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews.	(D. Appleton & Co.)	
Holmes (Prof. F. S.), Phosphate Rocks of South Carolina, swd.	(Charleston)	1 25
Ingelow (Jean), Songs of Seven, swd.	(Roberts Bros.)	0 30
Kiepert (H.), Wall Map of the Ancient World, in six sheets.	(L. W. Schmidt)	
Macdonald (G.), Ralph Bannerman's Boyhood.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	
Olmsted (D.), Introduction to Natural Philosophy.	(Collins & Bro.)	
Rae (W. F.), Westward by Rail.	(Longmans & Co.)	
Richardson (Frederica), Xavier and I.	(Chapman & Hall)	
Read (W. T.), Life and Correspondence of George Read.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	
Spalding (Louise B.), The Ruined Statues and Other Poems.		
Thomas (Dr. J.), Universal Pronouncing Dictionary of Biography and Mythology, Parts 13-17.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	
Taine (H.), Art in the Netherlands.	(Leypoldt & Holt)	
The Commercial Laws of the States.	(Baker, Voorhis & Co.)	
Wister (Mrs. A. L.), Enchanting and Enchanted.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	
Weeks (H. K.), Episodes and Lyric Pieces.	(Leypoldt & Holt)	

JUST PUBLISHED BY PORTER & COATES, 822 CHESTNUT STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

Longfellow's Poets and Poetry of Europe.

A New and Revised Edition, just completed, by H. W. Longfellow, with the addition of 150 pages of entirely new matter never before published, making it one of the most elegant and complete works extant. With Introduction, Biographical Notices, and Translations, from the earliest period to the present time. By Prof. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Illustrated with engravings on steel and engraved title. Imp. 8vo, cloth, extra gilt top, bevelled boards, \$6; sheep, marbled edges, library style, \$7 50; half-calf, gilt, \$9; Turkey morocco, \$12.

"This valuable work contains selections from about four hundred authors, translated from ten languages. Mr. Longfellow himself gives us translations from all these languages but two."—Allibone's Dict. of Authors.

"This edition has been revised and enlarged by the author, and contains his last touches and additions to his labors."—The Age, Philadelphia, Nov. 3, 1870.

"It is now a better book than ever, the Professor having added an Appendix and a Supplement, the latter dated 1870, containing a very precious list of newer poetical translations. The supplement is very choice and interesting, and absolutely rejuvenates the work. Here we have specimens from Bayard Taylor's translation of 'Faust,' not yet received in complete book-form, etc."—Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, Nov. 5, 1870.

Hedge's Prose Writers of Germany. A NEW AND REVISED EDITION.

With Introduction, Biographical Notices, and Translations. By FREDERIC H. HEDGE, D.D. With Six Portraits on Steel and Engraved Title. Imperial 8vo, cloth extra, gilt top, bevelled boards, \$5; sheep,

marbled edges, library style, \$6; half-calf, gilt, \$7 50; Turkey morocco, \$10.

"There is no book accessible to the English or American reader which can furnish so comprehensive and symmetrical a view of German literature to the uninitiated; and those already conversant with some of the German classics will find here valuable and edifying extracts from works to which very few in this country can gain access."—Prof. A. P. Peabody, in North American Review.

"A new and beautiful edition of a work of sterling merit."—The Age, Philadelphia, Oct. 29, 1870.

"It is a photograph such as is very much needed at this juncture for instant study."—N. A. and U. S. Gazette, Philadelphia, Oct. 27, 1870.

"Universally recognized as one of the best collections of specimens of German literature in the English language."—New York Tribune, Oct. 28, 1870.

"Its merits and value are well known. In this enlarged edition it will be sure to find renewed favor."—Boston Post, Nov. 3, 1870.

In Press:

GRISWOLD'S PROSE WRITERS OF AMERICA. New edition, revised and brought down to the present time.

AMERICAN ORNITHOLOGY. By Alex. Wilson. With Bonaparte's Continuation. Colored plates.

* * Sent by mail, postage paid, upon receipt of price. For sale by all Booksellers.

PUMPELLY'S TRAVELS, - - \$5

SPIELHACEN'S NOVELS, each, \$2

THE MENTAL PHOTOGRAPH ALBUM, - - - - \$1 50

LEYPOLDT & HOLT,

NEW YORK.

"The author is the first to gather the fragments of tradition and story in various languages, and combine them into a narrative which is animated and full of sympathy."—*Albany Argus*.

THE CHILDREN'S CRUSADE: AN Episode of the Thirteenth Century. By GEORGE ZABRISKIE GRAY. Price \$1 75. HURD & HOUGHTON, 13 Astor Place, N. Y.

JUST PUBLISHED.

ON THE USES OF WINES IN HEALTH AND DISEASE.

BY FRANCIS E. ANSTIE, M.D., F.R.C.P.,
Editor of *The London Practitioner*.

In one vol. Paper. Price 50 cts. Sent prepaid.
J. S. REDFIELD, 140 Fulton St., N. Y.

